

## INTERNATIONAL LIFE IN THE LIGHT OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

“**I**LS ont construit un temple où il ne manque qu'un Dieu,” said Count Lós at a recent meeting in London of the “Catholic Council for International Relations.” He spoke of the League of Nations and the whole theory of international life embodied in that institution. Aristotle and Cicero, unknowing, prepared the foundations of the Christian philosophy of the scholastics, and Julius Cæsar, unconscious, too, of the Christian destinies of Rome, prepared the political groundwork of the Holy Roman Empire. So also, he believed, a Wilson, a Cecil, a Bourgeois, a Viviani and all the “world builders” or pacifists of the age (divorced from Catholic tradition as they may be, or even professionally un-Christian), have evolved a philosophy and have constructed an instrument responding to the exigencies, economic and political, of the contemporary world, which it remains for the Church to sanctify and perfect. True, the edifice requires not a little reinforcing; fragments of Catholic thought; “Brotherhood”; “Solidarity”; “Interdependence of peoples”; “Justice, the rule of international conduct”; and so on, have been inherited somewhat disjointedly from their Catholic past by the builders of this new Europe. Cleansed from their sentimental accretions, these notions require to be cemented and co-ordinated by that central doctrine of the objective Moral Law; they need the staying power of Supernatural Grace, and that sense of proportion which comes from a constant remembrance of man's immortal destiny; and those things it is the function of Catholic Christianity to supply. Whether you like it or no, a permanent League of Nations *has* been put together by clumsy human hands. In that sense, the temple of international life is ready. What are Catholics going to do with it?

They must bring God into it; and, so doing, they must bring His Church into her own. Indeed there is no sphere in which the magisterium of the Church Universal can more properly be exercised than in upholding the divine laws of Justice and Charity in the relations between all those nations from which her spiritual children are drawn.

That conviction has often found expression in these columns;

reiterated by Pope after Pope, it has gradually awakened responsive echoes in this country and in that during these years in which consciences have been seriously troubled about the ethics of peace and war. Sermons, review articles, books on the subject have been slowly increasing. Courageous little international conferences of Catholics have been convened by the "I.K.A." organization at Graz, Lucerne, Lugano, Einsiedeln, and by others at Reading and Paris. Poorly attended at first, these gatherings have had their cumulative effect. Steady endeavours to bring Catholic influence to bear upon the League, have been maintained for seven years—rather meagrely in the beginning, now more openly and constructively—by the "Union Catholique" of Fribourg. Catholic Peace Societies, with their publications, have come into being in France, Germany, Holland, and elsewhere. The forming of our "Catholic Council for International Relations" in England, was a real step forward in this process. The force of its example, imparted to many minds in the Old World and the New by its International Conference at Oxford last year, has, among its many reactions, made possible a yet more notable development—the concentration of a vast and truly representative concourse of the Catholic clergy and laity of a great country upon this very subject—"International Life in the light of Catholic doctrine."

Such was the "Semaine Sociale de France," held at Havre in August, which we will shortly describe. No longer did those of us who are concerned in this task in nineteen other countries come to find at Havre the usual little band of enthusiasts or specialists. We found *over twelve hundred* French men and women settling down to a solid week's study. We listened to papers, many of which were the outcome of a lifetime of thought and research, read to a crowded hall, in which one could hear a pin drop, four times a day. We found them discussed outside in the great court of the Institut S. Thomas d'Aquin with all the vivacity and persistency that attaches to a subject of vital human interest. Of the "Auditeurs" fully half were ecclesiastics, some old curés, others young men fresh from the seminaries, busy with their notebooks. Throughout these courses, which resembled those of a University, there were no resolutions, no applause, no "hot-air" whatever. True, an outlet for French spirits was found in the friendly speeches at the daily luncheons and at the banquet given to foreigners one evening; but there was

none of the cant generally associated with peace conferences. The enthusiasm of the "semainiers" also infected the Catholic people of the great city, and it is estimated that not less than 2,500 crowded each of the four popular evening gatherings, the opening Benediction in Notre Dame, at which the Archbishop of Rouen preached on "Pax Christi in Regno Christi"; the Holy Hour at S. Michel, when the Abbé Thellier de Poncheville gave a devotional address on "The Eucharist and Peace"; the Père Coulet's great meeting on "The Church as a Supernational Society" in the Salle Franklin, and another Mass Meeting on the last evening when Cardinal Dubois presided and "the conclusions of the week's study" were expounded in simple terms by M. de las Casas. The Hierarchy was strongly represented; the Archbishop took the Chair himself at each of the lectures, except those at which the Cardinal of Paris, the Bishop of Arras, the Bishop of Agen, or the Bishop of Bayeux and Lisieux replaced him. With him on the platform and at the great religious ceremonies was also an English Bishop, Mgr. Bidwell, who had come with a number of English visitors to demonstrate the community of interests between the Catholics of the two countries and to encourage this welcome new departure in France. We would add but two other observations upon the general character of the School: first, its membership was really *representative*. Catholics of the Right, like the Père de la Brière, mixed with those of Republican views, like Mgr. Beaupin and MM. Zirnheld and Tessier, the leaders of the Syndicats Chrétiens; there were, in addition, a number of big business men, employers, Chairmen of Chambers of Commerce; the "Action Populaire" was represented by the R.P. Desbuquois, R.P. Danset, and several others; M. René Pinon gave, frankly enough, the view of the political journalists of the Poincaré school, and M. Lucien Romier, the brilliant economist, generally associated with a "strong policy," surprised us with a cold, well-balanced lecture upon the utter futility of war to achieve the economic good of a nation. The University element was much in evidence—for the Semaine Sociale is indeed "une Université ambulante." Duthoit and Delos of Lille, Le Fur of Paris, Valensin of Lyon, Bodin of Rennes, Turmann of Fribourg, Cuche of Grenoble—all these are names of high standing in the academic world. Lawyers like MM. Cretinon and Lerolle played their part too. M. Georges Goyau, the venerable academician, brought all the weight of his authority as a

sociologist and historian, and the leaders of practically every Catholic society, professional and otherwise, that is concerned with social welfare came to Havre to meet one another and to hear the lectures. Enthusiasts of "La Démocratie" and "L'Action Française" both cried their wares as the "semainiers" passed in and out. But they did not do good business. One had the impression that almost every school of political thought permissible to Catholics between these two was represented.

The other fact of singular importance is that MM. Gonin and Boissard, the devoted organizers of the National Summer Schools ever since 1904, found to their surprise that the subject of International Peace had attracted a crowd of members far greater in numbers and in quality than those who had attended any of the seventeen previous Sessions on other subjects.

Such are the reasons that justify us in claiming that the Havre Summer School is the most important step yet taken by the Catholics of any country since the war to "Bring God into the temple of internationalism."

Let us describe shortly in what way so widely representative a gathering, under such direct ecclesiastical guidance, approached that most elusive and confusing subject "International Life."

The subject was roughly divided into three courses—doctrinal lectures, critical essays and descriptive or documentary lessons. Of the latter we need say little; they simply and truthfully recorded the international Institutions of the present day as we know them. It was the doctrinal lectures which provided the "pièce de résistance" of the week's study. M. Eugene Duthoit, President of the National Summer Schools' Committee, delivered an admirable lecture on "How Catholicism conceives and harmonizes duty to one's country with the duties of one nation to another." After vindicating the authority of the Church to determine the necessary adjustment between the seemingly conflicting duties of patriotism and internationalism, he showed how the former was grounded in Nature, as were the even more fundamental duties and affections of the Family; and yet how peace between nations, based on the recognition of mutual moral obligations, was not less required by reason and indeed postulated as the condition of the divinely promised Catholicity of the Church. He concluded: "There is no friction between Patriotism and International co-operation. The conflict lies



elsewhere. It lies between the two cities of St. Augustine, the one founded on "the love of Self unto contempt of God," the other on "the love of God unto the contempt of Self." This served as the text to which most of the other lecturers spoke in this course. M. Georges Goyau repeating the gist of his remarkable report to the Academy of International Law at The Hague, illustrated the pacific functions of the Church and of the Holy See with a wealth of historical detail. He described that painful wrestling with the morality of military service in the post-Apostolic age, which, after the trial of many varying opinions, lead in the clear minds of S. Ambrose and S. Augustine to the settled doctrine of just and unjust war destined to be further clarified by the distinction of S. Thomas between material and formal sin, and to be developed into a comprehensive code of International conduct by Vittoria, Suarez and Taparelli. He expounded S. Augustine's conception of peace, not as a negative state of inertia but as one of positive effort, an effort of the human will to maintain order in human society decreed by the Divine Will, an effort which must constantly be renewed after setbacks; and he showed that this conception underlay the Papal Theocracy of the Middle Ages and the no less persistent peace-making of the Popes since the disruption of Christendom. In the *Truga Dei* of the 11th and 12th centuries, whose extension and operation he described very graphically, M. Goyau saw the beginning of the Church's increasing endeavour to diminish and circumscribe the horrors of War, which, even when permitted under prescribed conditions, is none the less an accursed thing. This tendency was carried still further by the exemption of Franciscan and Dominican tertiaries from the feudal oath, which practically destroyed private warfare. In fine, it was to Catholic Christianity alone that we owed all those Laws of War, which it was now the fashion to decry, but which, by keeping the use of violence somewhat at least within bounds, had spared suffering humanity a deal of material and spiritual ills. This is not new to those who have read their "Primer of Peace and War," and M. Goyau's instances of Papal mediation and arbitration were also not unfamiliar, except for one dramatic account of the Mediation effected by a priest on the Pope's behalf between the Tsar of Russia and the Poles at the end of the 16th century. He recalled Leo XIII's bold vindication of the Church's role as the guardian of international justice, by his practical solution of

the German-Spanish conflict of 1885, and his letters to the Hague Conference of 1899, and he told of the mediations of Pius X's Nuncios in Latin America. "What benefit the League of Nations could derive from the help of a Power with such a tradition as the Papacy and such recent services to its credit," concluded M. Goyau, "and how much strength it loses by failing to have recourse to the help of the Holy See."

Father Desbuquois pursued this line of thought in a later lecture on "The Relations between the Church and the League." Without going into very great detail, he contended that the logical conclusions of historical experience and Catholic theory required an organic connection of some sort between the Holy See and the League. We were glad to see that he excluded altogether the possibility of Papal membership of the League, which certain French Catholic critics mistakenly advocated at one time. No such political and economic trammels as the obligations of membership would involve, could be accepted by the Pope without damage to the independence and supranational character of his sacred mission. It was quite another matter to postulate a system of *collaboration* and mutual consultation between the head of the Church and the temporal rulers of the world in their deliberations. Such a system could be constructed without any infringement of Catholic tradition upon the relations of Church and State; and the habit of asking the good counsel of the Holy See upon any proposal or convention which involved moral issues, and its assistance in the composition of quarrels, would certainly enable the Christian spirit to be brought constantly into action in this long and difficult process of organizing International Peace. The establishment of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Secretariat at Geneva would appear to be the most natural way of bringing this about.

It was the Père Yves de la Brière, who has long held the Chair of International Law at the Institut Catholique, who gave us the fruits of eight years' study and observation on the League itself. His first lecture was a purely objective account of the League at work—Council, Assembly, Secretariat, Permanent Court, and sundry commissions. His second was historical and critical. After tracing the various influences, American, British, South African and French, which brought the League into existence, he traced their development in that institution since its start. He found the wording of the

Covenant "confused, unfinished and hasty," but, unlike most French critics, he sees no great disadvantage in this; greater definition of objects and functions would have been difficult at the start and "the somewhat elastic nature of the organization had proved fortunate to the League." The principle difficulties he sees ahead of the League are twofold: first, the danger of protracted failure in achieving the reduction of armaments—a failure whose cause is to be found in the radical difference between France and those countries who, with her, regard the treaty frontiers as sacrosanct and the League as being principally a means of assuring their permanency; and the other nationalities who aspire to bring about sooner or later a profound change in the treaty settlement. Secondly, he fears that the extension of the Council to an unwieldy size, consequent upon the controversy over Germany's admission, "threatens to throttle the activity of the League altogether."

He made one other novel conclusion which, if it be true, is of great moment in the development of International law.

"The growth of the League during six years has had an important result. It has not become a Superstate, but it has assumed a vitality of its own *apart* from that of the States that belong to it. This is the consequence of the considerable tasks with which it is constantly entrusted. The League of Nations stands as an International Person and as a Sovereign Power, not above but beside the other Sovereign Powers, a growth unforeseen by the makers of the Covenant of 1919." His rider is no less interesting, though we believe highly disputable. "The development of this concept of Sovereignty is of great importance as helping one to realize the true nature and absolute fact of the sovereignty of the Holy See, as long as it is not actually possessed once more of territorial power. The sovereignty of the International fabric of Geneva in its present state of development, like the Papacy in its present position of being a Sovereign Power without territory, leads to spiritualizing the juridical concept of sovereignty." Who said "*Silete theologi in munere alieno*"?

There were many more of these lectures which described modern International institutions or branches of the League or political developments. M. Waline analysed, almost with the leisure of a surgeon at a post-mortem examination, the Locarno agreements; we conclude from him, however, that the patient may live, or resurrect, yet. M. Martin Saint Léon

gave us the most painstaking description of the many confusing International Labour Associations, good, bad and indifferent; and M. Boissard dealt faithfully with the International Labour Office, whose Socialist Director, M. Albert Thomas, was officially represented at Havre—*mirabile dictu*—by a priest who is now one of the officials on his staff, Père Arnou, S.J. M. René Pinon, Political Editor of the "*Revue des Deux Mondes*," confessing himself to be the Devil's Advocate, produced a gloomy paper upon the obstacles to peace. What with wicked Bolsheviks, tricky Germans, usurious Americans, filibustering Italians, the Yellow Peril, and most of all, perfidious Albion, M. Pinon must pass many a sleepless night. He was quite bitter about the obstinate unwillingness of British governments to pledge themselves in advance to giving military assistance to France and her allies. All this is stale news. What was truly remarkable at Havre was the universal comment on this paper: "*Ce qui manquait c'était un examen de conscience de la France!*"

This little explosion, however, gave Bishop Bidwell the opportunity, in a graceful speech at the dinner given to foreign visitors, to remind his hearers that the simple Entente of pre-war days, without any specific treaty obligation, was enough to bring England to the side of France in her hour of need—in 1914, when the attack upon her and Belgium was patently unjust. He pleaded for a deeper confidence than that which depended upon the "jots and tittles" of treaties, La Rochefoucauld had said: "*Il vaut mieux être trompé par ses amis que de s'en méfier*," and One greater than La Rochefoucauld had said: "*Love one another*"; yet without mutual confidence friendship was impossible. And he spoke of the many ties of blood and historic association which bound the Catholics of England to those of France, and of Normandy in particular. He gave a special place to the unity between France and England as a factor assuring the peace and well-being of Europe and the world.

But we will return, in conclusion, from these good-humoured battles of opinion to the development of Catholic doctrine upon the mutual rights and duties of nations, which we believe to have constituted the special value of the Havre Summer School. Among those who sought more profoundly "*rerum cognoscere causas*" we would particularly mention the Père Valensin in his admirable lecture on "*The Natural Laws of International Life*." We can not better illustrate the

high standard of the week's studies and the thoughts which they have set running in so many minds than by giving a brief précis of his paper :—

"The study of the *Natural Laws of International Life* belongs to the philosophy of human order. It involves the double task of ascertaining upon what foundation stands an organization of international life conformable to Right, and how it is to be brought into effect. It aims, that is, at formulating a principle together with the theories deduced from it.

"Neither can the principle of *absolute Sovereignty of the State*, which is ultimately idolatrous ; nor that of *Nationality*, which eludes perfect definition and is inapplicable as a general rule ; nor yet that of the *superiority of the White Race*, which is only prejudice and not principle, uphold the International Order required by Nature. That Order must ultimately be grounded on the principle of HUMAN SOCIABILITY.

"Whenever Nations renounce their geographical seclusion, they become *ipso facto* bound together. Then is begot a collective conscience in which, by mutual consent, the tendency of all towards a common end grows more powerful and distinct. The recurrent opposition of selfish interests is of small import. The influence of *social pioneers* sooner or later restores the tendency of nature ; the influence, that is, of qualified men who by their deliberate initiatives (like those of the engineer who cuts open an isthmus or canalises a stream) straightens the flow of international intercourse and brings about the growth of international life as an institution.

"Thus is a natural society of nations brought into being. But that organization implies the notion of some good to be jointly attained and the power to adjust the free wills of men to the requirements of that common weal. It therefore implies Right (but for which the Law of the Jungle will prevail), and human or positive law based on Right.

"Depending thus on the very nature of Human Society, International Life is amenable to the Moral Law which lays on the Nations the duty of dealing with one another in an honest and charitable spirit. Hence certain acts are forbidden in international intercourse by virtue of that Law :—political insincerity, which is ever conducive to the perversion of the public mind ; want of due regard for the freedom, property and repute of Nations ; breach of promises or treaties ; jealousy of more thriving Nations ; and, in the claiming

of one's National rights, disregard of the moderation which equity and human brotherhood require.

"Since International Life aims finally at the common welfare of all, the laws that regulate it are **UNIVERSAL**. They cannot, therefore, be invalidated when Nations differ in language, culture, political constitution or even in religion. But while the philosophy of the Spirit can lawfully uphold, at all events, the universal character of those laws, Materialistic Agnosticism is bound to jeopardize it; for by excluding from the foundations of the rights claimed by a man or a Nation whatever lies beyond the will of man, it subverts human society altogether.

"International Life can only find its supreme guarantee above itself; it can only find it in the Mind and Will to whom Creation is wholly subordinate, and the natural laws that rule this life are, therefore, divine. To gainsay this is to raise "idols in the City" and to set up political Myths deceiving men's minds; it is to render impossible the self-sacrifice required by International duty and to impede the preservation of a true state of society among the Nations.

"Therefore the study of the natural laws of International life makes it obvious that a choice is to be made between Matter and Spirit. If swayed by the lust of material wealth, Mankind has no other prospect but that of barbarous warfare. Whoever wants International Peace must choose the way of the Spirit."

One left this Havre Congress with the feeling that if Catholics would only realize what their providential function in this world is—*i.e.*, to make their faith regulate not merely their personal and social conduct, but also their International spirit, banishing from the latter all species of injustice and replacing it by Christian charity—the cause of Peace would progress whatever the vicissitudes of the political machinery formed to secure it.

JOHN EPPSTEIN.



## EDWARD IGNATIUS PURBRICK, S.J.

### III.

**F**R. PURBRICK took a complete view of his Province, and thought about a special aspect of it every day.

He foresaw the value of retreats, of social work, and of women's work, and was to support at all points Fr. Plater, still but a scholastic. He was eager for the development both of private study and of printed work. To Fr. M. Russell he wrote in 1868 :

My dear Father Russell, P.C. How good of you to write! In these days of simple business correspondence a letter of pure friendship (may I say friendship, not acquaintance?) is a real treat. It ought to be a treat eagerly seized to answer, but the tardiness of my reply may make you doubt my sincerity if I say *is* instead of ought to be. . . . You ask about the *Month*. . . . I long to see the *Month* with a staff of men, and a little more space given to the great subjects which in these days agitate men's minds, and about which answers ought to come from Catholic Oracles. Some are afraid to speak lest they perchance might rouse controversy or incur odium or make an occasional mistake ; but who expects infallibility in a periodical? To be ever safe is to be always dull. Question after question arises, unsettles minds, leaves impressions, does a work often deadly enough, and meanwhile we live in our shells, and only occasionally with the utmost caution thrust our heads out a little way and with telescopic eyes glance at such subjects, throw out a timid hint or so and withdraw. This is a snail's policy, and if we adopt it we shall be left like snails behind the world, comfortably crawling to our own content over the gravel but leaving only a faint trace of our passage and doing little good to our day and generation.

And in 1869 he wrote to Fr., then Mr., Stevenson, who wished to devote himself to a historian's work, that all manuscripts of historical interest belonging to the Province should be open to his inspection :

For my own part I think the age of mysterious privacy is gone, and that the more the true sources of history can

be reached the ampler will be the vindication of God's Church,

gave him every permission that might facilitate his work and promised to shield him from interruption, adding, how characteristically! "Construe everything *largely*"; and "apprenticed" Fr. John Pollen, during a summer vacation, to Fr. J. Morris, in the hopes that his historical "hobby" would lead to first-rate work, as indeed it did.

His affection for his men was real: after a sad loss of vocation, if not of faith, he wrote:

Still, such a catastrophe afflicts one more indefinitely than the death of any number of our dearest fathers. They at least have had the happiness of final perseverance as we may assuredly believe. But he—well, we can still hope and pray that through God's mercy he may yet bring joy to the Angels and to us.

His letters to the United States prove how fond he had become of his confrères there, and they of him. Every name is recalled, every incident mentioned. Indeed, there too his tender care for individuals had not ceased amid his thousand preoccupations: he sought, in the Bowery, for the brother of a penitent of his, "until he found him": I think that the man proved recalcitrant: he was one of those failures whom Fr. Purbrick just called, "Left to God." He loved to tell how Fr. Bernard Vaughan had returned from the States full of tales of their hospitality and kindness, and wrote of him:

He stands out prominently and eminently alone—incomparable for his magnetic power and splendid gifts of humour and flow of spirits, happily irrepressible—and he resembles the Cardinal in his spirit of prayer and genuine humility;

while once, hearing a fellow-religious who was coming to replace an old friend, criticized, he exclaimed: "You hurt me! Remember you are talking of my brother!" and added, with his wonted charm: "Remember that I myself wasn't too welcome at first among you, for a like reason: but we soon became great friends."

Few realized, however, the extent of Fr. Purbrick's "direction" work, which lay quite outside his governmental duties. Not that he intended by means of "direction" to cramp, or tyrannize over, souls.

I want you to learn not to make a fuss *even to yourself* about every little feeling or symptom. Spiritual hippishness is worse than physical. It is a part of direction to teach souls to walk by themselves and not always to toddle a yard out held by a leading string and then rush back to the nurse's petticoats. It is this minuteness or rather minutiousness of many women which keeps their souls always little, cramped, undeveloped. But I see no reason why you should not develop ; nor is it unwomanly to have virile virtue and the power of choice of and by themselves.

I fear to write because my doing so is the signal for a prompt answer containing questions or requests for advice. Yet you have no idea what it costs me now to write a letter. As to a director, I am much of Fr. A's mind that you need not be for ever in leading strings. Much time is wasted by women (both their own and the director's) by their perpetual recourse for advice on every little point they can think of. A good confessor who will also give a few general principles for guidance is quite enough. A director is for the spiritual life, not for discussing or advising on all sorts of questions, *e.g.*, of ways and means.

Don't look to or wait for me to settle every little thing. Make up your own mind, purify your intention, and act for the best. Even were you to make a mistake, the mistake would not much matter : it would be without fault.

Try and acquire the habit of decision and prompt decision when your first impulse is to say what you know is good in itself.

But when the penitent could not decide, he decided himself, and *decisively*, expecting to be obeyed.

(Do not make a general confession.) Do as I bid you, not because it is I, or from any motive of personal regard or trust in my judgment as a man. No, then indeed you might fear deceit. But in the relation in which I stand to you, I am God's instrument, and in trusting me, you trust Him. He wishes you only good ; He cannot deceive you. The defects of the instrument He can and will compensate. Only He will not work without an instrument because He wants you to be grounded in those two solid and foundation virtues of humility and obedience.

The offering (*viz.*, of all good and meritorious actions

for the conversion of England) I approve, but the vow "to do all I can" is rash and may easily give rise to scruples. Please consider it null or annulled.

His direction was always positive :

Look away from self—do not be perpetually analysing your motives, feelings, etc., etc., but look ever upwards and onwards to God. Get out of the infinite and inextricable confusion of "may-be's" and "perhaps's!"

And he would suffer neither sadness nor anxiety about "progress" : he loved to quote :

"Is any sad amongst you? Let him pray."

The form of humility that will help you most will be to suffer no anxiety about "progress."

Do you expect to know how many miles you have advanced on the road towards perfection? Why there are no milestones that I know of by which to measure progress, and if there were, and you could calculate exactly, why the next thing would be that you would either have your head turned and in the moment of self-congratulation would roll downhill and lose more than you fancied you had gained, or else you would yield to discouragement, fold your hands and give up struggling.

In the First Week of the Exercises, don't waste time on examining, but pray for a spirit of heroic compunction, hatred not merely of sin, but of all that is worldly or could lead to sin. This is better than "digging at yourself."

I wish you would break yourself of the habit of comparing past with present to the prejudice of the present. It is a snare. The devil is glad if he can make us sigh after what we have not, and discontented with what we have.

He was eager "never to get ahead of the Holy Ghost," and would not even tell penitents their faults till he thought they could bear it. The Divine Physician's hand, he often said, would slowly "squeeze from our hearts the last drop of bad black blood."

Ask too for large-mindedness and a great fund of loving sympathy. Sympathy goes such a long way in guiding others, and prevents *exigence*, or the impatience which leads one to try and get more out of others than the graces given them warrant our expecting.

In the same way, he would not allow exaggerated self-mortification : to one who urged that it was " more perfect " always to do the less pleasant thing, he retorted : Why then did Our Lord choose to live so long with His holy Mother ?—and this thought haunted him : he felt that " to live along with Mary " *must* be the best way of imitating Jesus. What he did ask was, that likes and dislikes should not rule one's life :

You seem to think you have gone back, because once you managed to disguise from your Superiors any and every dislike ; and so you say " I intend to try, God helping me, to do everything as if I liked it." If that means, to try and not let likes and dislikes influence your choice, well and good. But if it means making believe you like when you don't, the benefit of such a course is very questionable.

Sept. 21st, 1895. I am in no such luck. From my noviceship on I have always longed for the foreign missions, but my Superiors have never found in me virtue enough to be exposed to its dangers, and now they would hardly think of sending an old man of 65, already nearly rusted out, to the tropics for the first time in his life. It might be a handy and convenient way of disposing of rubbish for good and all. But they commonly resist all such temptations.

They must have seen that I was too much attached to the quiet peaceful life of my last office, and are determined to shake me up a bit by sending me where I shall be plunged again into external bustle, and where all the energy and enterprise of youth are needed to do justice to the situation. And then Fr. X is inspired (by a savage irony I should not have expected in him) to say *I like the move !!* Thank God one's likes and dislikes are not taken into account in making appointments, and I have not yet asked myself whether I like it or not. I had not dreamed of such a post, nor heard it mentioned till the order came ; so I am able to say God's will be done. *Deo gratias*. That is the long and short of it. . . . David was an old man when he said : *Ego dixi, nunc coepi*. I suspect he had often had to say it before, and this I know, that if it were the thousandth time, the words coming from the heart, *i.e.*, the expression of the will, were sweet music in the ears of our Lord. *He* is never tired of hearing them. Why should *I* be ? We are all very weak creatures, and the

moment we are left at all to ourselves we begin to stumble and tumble. By letting us go for the moment and find out our own helplessness, our Lord teaches us what we are and how we need Him. Peter *really* began to sink in the waters of the sea of Galilee, but when he cried out to our Lord, the all-powerful hand upheld him. That is the thing. We have to recognize our own weakness and His strength. Then we shall not fail to pray, to *beg* from our poor frightened hearts for His help—and such prayer infallibly brings help, though it may bring also the gentle reproach, "O ye of little faith."

Be brave, then, be very simple with our Lord, and don't think for a moment that it is seeing me oftener would make the difference. You can see Him as often as you choose, and what cannot He do? What is He not longing to do for you if only you will let Him? That is what we want—not to think of the Blessed Sacrament merely, or Holy Communion merely, as if they were mere institutions or Christ's instruments only, but to think always—Jesus, the living Jesus, Jesus my Lord and my God, is here in the Tabernacle, and I must go and tell Him all my heart . . . I can't get on alone.

Religious vocations were cared for by him with the greatest circumspection. When a vocation was not an affair of practical politics (as, during the lifetime of a parent who needed tendance) he would not allow it to be thought about : there was to be no "halting between two opinions." But he would wait for years for a vocation to mature : his teaching of Latin, already mentioned, was in view of a vocation that was very distant. With those who gave up the idea he was very gentle : all he inquired was, whether this was due to a general slackening off, or whether the finger could be put on a definite reason. When a vocation was decided on, he tabooed imagination, with its fears or fanciful hopes :

About your entrance, it is not necessary to be for ever thinking of and imagining it, etc. When I walk up to Town, I am not at every moment saying, I must be at Farm St. in an hour . . . but somehow I do not slacken my pace, and go on steadily till I reach my destination. Why? In virtue of the first act or determination of my will. Nor do I heed various feelings about the matter which may pass through me from time to time. So you



e  
d  
e  
e  
r  
.  
l.  
-  
s  
e

t  
l  
)  
o  
r  
y  
.  
e  
;  
n  
s

r  
o  
t  
n  
.  
y  
r  
n



in this matter must not make any account of changes of feeling. You have made up your mind and with God's blessing you will carry out your purpose.

The highest and best of ideals is to do and bear in all things the Will of God, and I fear that you may be turning your ideals into idols, letting them become for themselves and because they were your idols, objects of attachment for their own sakes : (also) that you are apt to be critical of those around you and unconsciously to magnify to yourself all the drawbacks and disadvantages of your position, to cast your eyes back upon the congenial and refined Religious at X.

And even within the Convent, he preached a sane and sober virtue.

God is very anxious that you should grow into a very steady, earnest, persevering nun, and show your gratitude by not losing any opportunity of making sacrifices of your own will to Him. I shall go on praying and specially that you may ever advance in the solid virtues, humility, obedience, the spirit of sacrifice. These ensure even progress and unpretentious holiness ;

and to the end advised Superioresses to be slow to admit, and slower still to re-admit :

The door should open outwards more easily than inwards. But there can be no question of fast lines. Wisdom does not deal in sweeping generalities. . . . Usually there must be some test of constancy, some delay, some trial, if only to raise appreciation of what is not easily regained.

Many of Fr. Purbrick's letters leave on one an impression of correctness, rather than of imaginative intimacy. Others have in them a sort of official cheerfulness that does not cheer. It may have been felt that the rules for his Provinciate were after all what any sensible and conscientious civil servant, even army officer, might have imposed on himself with regard to his subordinates. Certainly it is extraordinary how Fr. Purbrick keeps out of his correspondence his varied interests, his alertness to the innumerable facts of the day ; his sense, not only of literature and art, but, so to say, of the three-dimensional Church—the massive historical fact—and seems to think in terms of ethics only, of rational behaviour in the

circumstances. Well, remember that they *were* letters concerned with behaviour: he was essentially a Governor, and saw a scheme of life, even while very conscious of the individual soul. Moreover, many of his correspondents required a very strong dose of reason, if not rationalism—moods and feelings were strong in them, and apt to sway them. And when we hear that his “only” regular spiritual reading was Rodriguez on Spiritual Perfection—he said that a page a day was enough, provided you took a quarter of an hour over it—we wonder whether he was really a very grim man, controlled at the expense of his humanity. Very far from it. His Mass meant everything to him—he could not bring himself to accept St. Ignatius’s suggestion that on certain days of a retreat it might be omitted. “How could I be the better for that?” he asked. Long before Pius X.’s decree on frequent Communion, he urged that practice; and he went daily to Confession. He did, too, read and love other books—Meschler’s *Humanity of Jesus*—“very precious, golden, priceless—deserves to be read and pondered over word by word”—an anonymous book on God our Father, and Caussade’s great work on “Abandonment.” Even during his illness some fifteen years before his death, and long before he gave up work, which indeed he never really did, and when he could write:

In my present state of head weariness and incapacity too it is impossible not to feel how poor and ineffective must be any communication of mine seeing that all composition is a burden to which I feel utterly unequal. You don’t and I hope you never will know what it is to have the constant pressure of a great patch of extravasated blood upon the brain which though leaving one so generally well as to prevent all sympathy, yet paralyses all effort and dries up all the channels of thought. God’s holy will be done;

he was still recognizing and welcoming friends as if he had seen them but the other day, and, as he kept insisting, heart then spoke to heart as letters never could.

He always suffered torments from headache, though we are told that no one would have guessed it. At one retreat, a lady, calling at his room, noticed that he looked very tired, and said she would come later. “Stay,” said he, “if it is not you, it will be another.” The visitor asked if she should sit quietly by the window without speaking,

and at least keep others out! He admitted this, and after the quarter of an hour remaining before the next meditation, during which he seemed to have been praying continuously, he just said: "God bless you, my child: I am *very* grateful." Not that this implied softness! To the same lady, who had indignantly said of someone—"I cannot think how she could have done such a thing; I *couldn't* have done it"—"No, Miss Pharisee," he replied, "but you might have done much worse!"

It is right, finally, to know that his old age, tortured by rheumatism, deafness, anguishing headache, a tendency to fall (with frequently serious results, such as a dislocated shoulder) was beset, too, no wonder, with a frightful sense of loneliness.

In December, 1910, he wrote:

The sense of loneliness grows too with advancing age. One cannot expect to retain for ever amidst all the changes of age, health, occupation, external interests and the rest, all the freshness of feeling, sympathy, etc., one had with one's earlier associates. Necessarily there creep into the very fibre of one's being divergences of taste, thought, impressions, which drive us more or less apart in a variety of interests and ways. Yet need this imply any greater nearness to or distance from God? . . . It all comes to this. As the sensible helps leave us one by one, we are thrown more exclusively on God, and He by His very infinitude makes up to us and more than makes up to us by strength of purpose and solidity of principle, rendering us less dependent on creatures and circumstances and by consequence more dependent upon Him.

There is but one remedy for that, and he possessed it—a personal love of Our Lord Jesus Christ. He often spoke of having been "cheated" of the best part of his life, because he had not been brought up to love Our Lord, His Mother and His friends. This, he said, had been like a living death, spiritually. This left its consequences, both in his enduring sensitiveness to lack of sympathy in others, and in the intuitive sympathy he could feel and even show (often so much harder). He not rarely spoke of the religious life as a "vocation to loneliness," dwelt on the loneliness of Our Lord, and said that this experience would be unbearable, unless a man had an overwhelming and personal love for Our Lord. Only once,

said he, had his childhood possessed one who understood his craving for sympathy, and "she was taken from me very early." His great self-control probably disguised this: even his dwelling on the need for overcoming sensitiveness at the beginning of religious life showed that he spoke from experience: he repeated that when things became insupportable, the only method was to take them one by one, less even than a day at a time, and never to reflect upon to-morrow or yesterday. "I know," he said, "that to some people this seems a mean way—not to face everything—but I always did it, and I sometimes think it is the only way." The knowledge, he said, that Our Lord has care for us, compensated for everything: "Cast thy care upon Him, for He careth for you," was the invariable conclusion of his letters to one correspondent: and when he spoke, he seemed not rarely to have been actually consulting with Our Lord in person. "Ask Our Lord: consult Our Lord," were phrases constantly on his lips.

Already at Liverpool, his confessional had been thronged. In his last days at Manchester, his room, when he could no more go down to the church, became the habitual confessional of hundreds, priests numerous among them. And when he became quite flung back upon himself he had recourse to that "life of pure praise" for which St. Ignatius teaches that man was created. In a Manchester slum, an old woman lived, so palsied that she could do nothing for herself. Her neighbours, very early in the morning, before they started to their work, made her tea, left near her something that she could eat at noon, and returned in the evening to befriend her. In the interspace, she spent her time bowing her head and reciting the Gloria Patri. Fr. Purbrick knew her well, and *took her for his model*. "How beautiful," he exclaimed, "is her life of praise!" And this life, to the end, was his own.

These pages, then, have aimed at no more than offering some indication that a man has lived amongst us, the secrets of whose soul will be revealed to us in heaven, and for whose participation in Our Lord we may already glorify his Creator.

C. C. MARTINDALE.



## THE ALBIGENSIAN HERESY<sup>1</sup>

THE two little books that lie before us are quite interesting, but singularly unsatisfying.

Mr. Holmes' study is professedly little more than a digest, or *précis*, of Schmidt's *Histoire et Doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois*: no detailed study of primary sources has been attempted. M. des Porcellets' pamphlet displays some familiarity with contemporary documents, although he has employed those documents in a manner which one might describe as selective. Both works are unfortunately vitiated by the more or less openly propagandist spirit in which they have been composed. There is little, if any, attempt at critical judgment or the dispassionate weighing of evidence. So far, indeed, from understanding the problems that they are up against, neither author seems to have realized that there are any problems at all. Neither has made any use of the Inquisitorial registers.

Mr. Holmes is concerned to show, on the one hand, that Catholicism is just as much a dualistic philosophy as was the Albigensian heresy; and, on the other, that the dualism of the Albigenses was merely the dualism of Christianity developed to its logical conclusions. He deduces that, since there were no fundamental differences of doctrine between the two philosophies, the only reason why the Albigenses were persecuted was that they dared to set themselves up against the swelling bigotry of the Popes.

M. des Porcellets, however, is convinced that the Albigenses did not hold a dualistic philosophy at all; that they were simple Bible Christians, whose teachings anticipated those of sixteenth century Protestantism. The religion of the Albigenses, he tells us, differed little from that now professed by all Protestants. From these very different premises he draws the same inference as Mr. Holmes, declaring that "the only difference between Pope Innocent III., who ordered the massacre of the Albigenses, and Popes Leo XIII. and Pius X., is that he had the power to put into practice that which they had no power to enforce." In the course of his study M. des Porcellets sharply criticizes the present writer in connection with a recent essay in one of the reviews.

<sup>1</sup> *The Albigensian, or Catharist, Heresy*, by E. G. A. Holmes. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd., 1925.)

*The Albigenses of Languedoc*, by A. P. des Porcellets. (Published privately.)

There is plenty of room at the present time for an accurate study, based upon primary sources, of the Albigensian heresy : its origins, its ceremonies and its teachings. Such a study would, of course, be concerned with the thing simply as an historical problem. But, quite apart from its historical interest, I fancy that it would be valuable and instructive in other ways as well. For dualism is one of the hardiest of the perennials, and in our own time we have seen a very widespread revival of the dualistic philosophy in a form very little different from that of Catharism. Comparative religion, indeed, is no concern of the historian. But a purely historical study of the most detailed and the most logical dualistic philosophy that has ever existed amongst men—to wit, the Albigensian heresy—might well be of great practical interest to all who study the thought and the tendencies of our own time.

It will be noted that I have boldly referred to the Albigensian heresy as a dualistic system, thus discarding at once the judgment of M. des Porcellets. On this particular point the evidence is overwhelming. From the time, early in the eleventh century, when the heresy made its first appearance in Europe, until the time of its final disappearance somewhere about the middle of the fourteenth century, all apologists are unanimous in referring to it as a revival of Manichæism. From Guibert, of Nogent, who describes the punishment of heretics at Soissons in 1114, up to Bernard Gui, Inquisitor of Toulouse from 1307 to 1323, they are in perfect agreement, both as to the beliefs and the ceremonies of these heretics. In all the great controversial works of the schoolmen these heretics are referred to simply as modern Manichees. Each apologist is at pains to refute the dualistic principle. He is at pains to prove the humanity as well as the divinity of our Lord, to justify the lawfulness of taking oaths, to disprove the Manichee doctrines concerning the sinfulness of marriage, and so on. Exactly the same line of attack is developed in each case. Whether the Albigenes of Languedoc actually held and taught these doctrines is a matter for further enquiry. For the moment I merely note that the presence of this great mass of controversial literature testifies to the existence in mediæval Europe of widespread Manichæism, whose strength was viewed with the greatest apprehension by all representative thinkers and with whose teachings all were perfectly familiar.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See e.g., Alanus de Insulis, *Contra hereticos* in Migne P.L. tome 210, cols. 355 ff.; Bonacursus *Vita hereticorum* in Migne P.L. tome 204, cols. 775 ff.; Bernardus Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis* (ed. Douais, Paris, 1886), pp. 236 ff.; N. Eymericus, *Directorium* (Venice, 1607), pp. 273 ff., etc.

It would be useless to attempt, within the limits of a short essay, to summarize the enormous quantity of evidence on this point. The presence of a powerful and highly organized Manichee church in twelfth-century Europe is one of the unquestioned and unquestionable facts of history. The Catharist heresy was, moreover, a society rather than a mere school of thought. Its adherents regarded themselves and were regarded by others primarily as members of that society rather than as holders of particular opinions. They were bound by a common discipline; they participated in certain ceremonies; they greeted one another in a particular fashion. In Languedoc they had a well-organized educational system, where children were apprenticed to a trade and to the practice of the Catharist religion. They had special convents for women in a great many places. Authority was vested in the episcopate in exactly the same manner as in the Catholic Church, and there is even evidence which suggests the existence of a supreme bishop or Pope of the sect.<sup>1</sup> During the latter half of the twelfth century there were five Albigenian bishops in Languedoc alone.

M. des Porcellets puts forward the truly remarkable suggestion that the Albigenes of Languedoc were an independent community, not affiliated in any way to the various Manichee sects of Italy, Bulgaria, Northern France and Hungary. The truth of this argument might be demonstrated in two ways: either by showing that the Albigenes did not profess Manichee or dualistic beliefs, or by demonstrating that the Albigenian sect was a self-contained body, confined exclusively to Languedoc and unattached by any ties of administration or organization to the Manichee communities in other countries. The former contention is the more plausible of the two; but it breaks down very completely before the evidence of the Inquisitorial registers. The latter proposition is frankly untenable.

In 1167 the strength of the Albigenes was so considerable that they were able to hold, without interruption, a council of their own near Toulouse. The president of the council was a personage referred to as the Lord Pope Niquinta (Nicetas), who hailed from Constantinople. Many dignitaries of the sect were present, including Mark, Bishop of Lombardy; Robert de Sperone, who came from a northern bishopric, and Sicardus Cellariensis, Albigenian Bishop of Albi. The *agenda* of the

<sup>1</sup> Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, anno 1223 (Rolls Series 57, iii, p. 78); Bouquet *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules*, tome XIV, p. 448.

assembly comprised the election of the new Bishops of Toulouse, Carcassonne and Val d'Aran. In a concluding address the president drew attention to the friendship and goodwill which united the Manichee Churches of Constantinople, Bulgaria and Dalmatia, and admonished the new bishops to extend and to preserve these feelings of solidarity.<sup>1</sup> The idea of an independent Albigensian Church in Languedoc is, therefore, without foundation.

As soon as we approach the question of Albigensian beliefs—as soon as we attempt to discover what these heretics did actually teach—we are confronted by a formidable difficulty. Thanks to the extraordinary success of the Inquisitors in destroying heretical literature whenever they came across it, we are left almost wholly without first-hand evidence in the matter. So far as I am aware, no single textbook of heretical doctrine or ceremonial has survived to the present day. We possess no contemporary account of the Albigensian heresy which was written by a member of the sect. Almost all our records are the work of men who were bitterly hostile to it, and, in many cases, of men who devoted their whole lives to its extirpation. We must, therefore, be prepared to discount a great deal of extravagant denunciation to which the heretics were subjected by contemporary chroniclers and apologists. Horrible stories were related of their secret ceremonies—stories of darkened rooms, extinguished lights and subsequent orgies of promiscuity and excess. Such charges have been levelled against almost every secret society in history; and whilst it would be extravagant to dismiss them all as malicious fabrications, it would be utterly absurd to take them as serious evidence. Moreover, we have to reckon with the age-long human tendency to tar all supposed malefactors with the same brush—to brand all heretics as Manichees, just as nowadays the more irresponsible newspapers dismiss all Socialists as Bolsheviks. In a word, we have to admit that there are two sides to nearly every question.

There exists, however, one very large body of evidence which gives us exactly what we want, and the neglect of which has led to much misunderstanding and erroneous speculation concerning the real beliefs and practices of the Albigenses. I refer to the registers of the Holy Office. These very voluminous archives and records were, it is true, transcribed by

<sup>1</sup> *Notitia Conciliabuli apud S. Felicem de Caraman*, in Bouquet *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules*, tome XIV, pp. 448-50.

officials of the Inquisition. But the suggestion that they were deliberately falsified or subsequently tampered with has never, to the best of my knowledge, been made; and we may dismiss any such idea summarily and without comment. Now in these registers we have the verbal statements of heretics. We get first-hand information on a thousand-and-one points concerning the beliefs, ceremonies, religious exercises and so on of the Albigensian heretics. The Inquisitorial registers, in fact, provide ample material for the compilation of a complete textbook of Albigensian practice, derived from the words of those who actually belonged to the sect.

Take, for instance, their cheerful ceremony known as the *Endura*—"a barbarous practice," as M. Tanon observes, "which one could scarcely believe unless one had such frequent allusions to it."<sup>1</sup> It consisted simply in the practice of suicide as a religious rite; and Vacandard gives us the judgment that:—

Everyone who reads the acts of the tribunals of the Inquisition at Toulouse and Carcassonne must admit that the *Endura*, forced or voluntary, put to death more victims than the stake or the Inquisition.<sup>2</sup>

The idea of the thing was roughly as follows. The Albigenses had a sort of sacrament called the *Consolamentum*, by the reception of which one was admitted automatically to their priesthood, the *Perfecti*. It served also in the same manner as the last Sacraments of the Church; it was administered to the Catharan laity, or "Believers," upon their deathbeds. But when once you had received the *Consolamentum*, you were vowed, as being one of the "Perfect," to a life of intense ascetism and self-denial. Consequently, if a sick person to whom it had been administered showed signs of recovery, there was a grave danger that he would be unable to sustain the rigid discipline and austerity of the "Perfect," to whose number he had automatically become admitted; and such failure, of course, meant the certain loss of his soul. Under these circumstances he would be strongly advised to ensure his future salvation by submitting to the *Endura*—in a word, to renounce the dangers and temptations of the world by committing suicide.

The actual number of persons who perished under these

<sup>1</sup> L. Tanon, *Histoire des Tribunaux de l'Inquisition en France* (Paris, 1893), p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, tr. Conway (New York, 1924), p. 72.

horrible circumstances must be largely a matter of speculation. But it is made clear from a study of the Inquisitorial records that the thing was frequently undertaken by people in perfect health. There are several instances in which children were deliberately starved to death by their parents under the supervision of the "Perfect." A woman called Montaliva died of starvation after keeping herself for six weeks upon an exclusive diet of water. A woman of Toulouse, after several unsuccessful attempts to consummate the *Endura* by blood-letting and the taking of poison, finally killed herself by swallowing pounded glass. A certain Guillaume Sabatier starved himself to death in seven weeks. A mother, whose baby daughter had received the *Consolamentum* and then showed signs of recovery, was strictly forbidden by the "Perfect" to nourish her child; and a few days later the little girl died.<sup>1</sup>

Neither M. de Porcellets nor Mr. Holmes make any mention of the *Endura*. The former, who is concerned to demonstrate that the Albigenses did not teach a dualistic philosophy, has presumably never heard of it. For nobody could possibly study the *Liber Sententiarum* or such documentary collections as those of Doat and Mgr. Douais without realizing the hopeless untenability of M. de Porcellets' position. He claims to have disposed of the old charge that the Albigenses condemned marriage; and he insists that "the religion of the Albigenses differed little from that now professed by all Protestants." Well, if you leave out the *Endura*, the theory is, at any rate, arguable. In the opinion of the present writer, it is a false theory; but at least there is room for debate. On the other hand, when you have once mentioned the *Endura*—the practice of suicide under the aegis of religion—you have given the theory its death-blow. There is no more to be said. The discussion is closed.

Mr. Holmes does not refer specifically to the *Endura*; but he commits himself, in a footnote, to the following judgment:—

"The worst that can be said of Catharist morality is that in certain circumstances it sanctioned suicide. But the circumstances were quite exceptional; and after all, extreme asceticism, whether practised by Catharist *perfecti* or Trappist monks, is slow suicide."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Liber Sententiarum Inquisitionis Tolosanae* (ed. P. A. Limborch, Amsterdam, 1692), pp. 33, 104, 111, 138, 143, 154, 179.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 128.



We are invited, then, to compare the austerities of a St. Bernard or a St. Francis with the swallowing of pounded glass, the opening of blood-vessels and the deliberate starvation of little children. I must admit that I find the points of contrast more prominent than the points of similarity. Moreover, if Mr. Holmes had made a study of the sources, he would surely have modified his opinion concerning the infrequency of the horrible rite.

In all parts of Europe the various Manichee sects—Cathari, Albigenses, Patarini, Bogomiles and so on—were credited by their opponents with a hearty condemnation of marriage. All the Christian apologists are concerned, in their controversial writings, to uphold the lawfulness of marriage and to refute the contrary doctrines of the heretics. Bonacursus, for instance, devotes a special section to the question<sup>1</sup>; and as he was himself an ex-Albigensian bishop who had been converted to Christianity, we may presume that he was not tilting at windmills. The great schoolman, Alan of Lille, says explicitly that the Albigenses condemned marriage. They asserted, he tells us, that if there were no such thing as marriage, there could be no such thing as adultery.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand it is difficult, apart from the evidence of the Inquisitorial records, to arrive at any final and conclusive judgment on the point. A number of heretics who were examined by the Council of Lombers in 1176 protested vigorously against the accusation that they condemned marriage. According to the evidence before the Council, "they had been accustomed to teach that a man and woman could not be saved if they had been carnally united." To this charge they replied by a specific denial, declaring that the marriage-act was not in itself sinful; and the presiding bishop remarked dryly:—"You are speaking rather under fear of the people than under fear of God." At any rate they refused to ratify their profession of faith by taking the usual oath of purgation; and the Council did not amend its judgment.<sup>3</sup>

Turning to the archives and documents of the Holy Office, we find a considerable amount of information concerning the Albigensian attitude towards marriage, the family, the procreation of children and so on. Before the Inquisitor, Guillem

<sup>1</sup> *Vita hereticorum*, cap. V (Migne, P.L. 204, cols. 780-1).

<sup>2</sup> *Contra hereticos*, iv. 62 (Migne, P.L. 210, cols. 365-7).

<sup>3</sup> *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden*, anno 1176 (Rolls Series 51, ii, pp. 105-117).

Pelhisse, an accused person defended himself by saying : " I am not a heretic ; for I have a wife and I live with her and we have a family."<sup>1</sup> In the register of the Inquisitor, Geoffrey d'Ablis, a suspected heretic is reported as saying that " it was a greater sin to lie with one's wife than with some other woman, since the thing is done more openly and without shame."<sup>2</sup> On April 9th, 1310, Bernard Gui, Inquisitor of Toulouse, passed judgment upon the famous heretical leader, Pierre Autier. The lengthy and detailed sentence of condemnation contained the following passage :—

" You also condemn the sacrament of marriage, and you assert that the marriage-act is always sinful and that it can never be performed without sin. You deny that the sacrament of marriage was instituted by God. . . . These and other terrible errors, as abominable as they are subversive, you, Pierre Autier, do heretically profess, as we have heard out of your own mouth."<sup>3</sup>

On April 30th, 1312, the heretic, Peter Raymond, was sentenced by the deputy Inquisitor, acting for Bernard Gui.

" And you do say and affirm in our presence," declares the writ of condemnation, " that you hold and believe the following damnable errors : that carnal marriage between man and woman is not true marriage, that it is neither good nor lawful, nor was it instituted by God. You assert that there is another type of spiritual marriage, as you have learnt from the heretics."<sup>4</sup>

We have the full account of the proceedings conducted by the Inquisitors, Bernard of Caux and John of St. Peter, between August 22nd and December 10th, 1247, against the prominent heretic, Peter Garsias. Witnesses on oath, whose statements overlap and corroborate one another, declared that Garsias had frequently and publicly maintained the following doctrines on the subject :—

That marriage was mere harlotry.

That no one who had a wife could possibly be saved.<sup>5</sup>

It would seem that the condemnation of marriage was a distinctive doctrine of the Catharist heresy ; and that these horrible teachings were disseminated in all districts where the

<sup>1</sup> Th. de Cauzons, *Histoire de l'Inquisition en France*, Vol. II, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> Tanon, *op. cit.* p. 229.

<sup>3</sup> *Liber Sententiarum*, p. 92.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 178.

<sup>5</sup> Douais, *Documents*, Vol. II, pp. 90-114.

heresy had obtained a hold. In Spain, for instance, a certain Durandus de Baldach, who was condemned by the great Aragonese Inquisitor, Eymeric, declared that marriage was nothing more than secret fornication.<sup>1</sup> As regards Languedoc, Bernard Gui tells us in his *Practica* that "they (the Albigenses) condemn marriage absolutely. . . . They declare that the marital relation is as great a sin as incest with one's mother, daughter or sister."

It is arguable, of course, that these extravagant views were held and taught only by a few extremists of the sect. But it is undeniable that the condemnation of marriage was a perfectly logical deduction from the dualistic principle. It would seem that in districts where the heresy was most powerful and well organized, its ethical teachings were boldest and most uncompromising. It is difficult, for instance, to regard the Albigensian heresy in Languedoc as anything but an anti-social and anarchic conspiracy. Certainly M. de Porcellets' attempt to prove that the Albigenses never attacked the institution of Christian marriage breaks down hopelessly before the testimony of the heretics themselves.

A. L. MAYCOCK.

<sup>1</sup> N. Eymericus, *Directorium* (Venice, 1607), p. 299.

# CHURCH AND STATE IN MEXICO

## AN IMPARTIAL SURVEY.

BY A RESIDENT

**T**HOSE national problems are most difficult of solution, because most heavily burdened with human passion, whose causes are embedded in the historical past of a people. A nation clings to nothing more closely than to its traditions, shaping its present hates and future fears according to its memory of past experience. The problem of Europe to-day consists not so much in its actual, ethnological, lingual and geographic differences, as in its people's memories of their ancient hates and fears. It is relatively easy to solve the differences presented by race, language or frontier, but it is impossible to re-write history and it is most difficult to still the apprehensions and the impulses which derive from the past history of a nation. Problems with such origins are fraught with danger and are almost impossible of equitable solution.

This is why a "modern" people, like the United States, for instance, starting as an advanced democracy, little burdened by tradition owing to their brief past and singularly forward-looking in their attitude to life, naturally find it most difficult to comprehend the apprehensions and animosities which sometimes sweep older nations into strange paths and along apparently illogical courses; but unless the observer can be induced to appreciate the deep significance of historical causes, he cannot have any complete understanding of the conflicts which shake nations which have inherited immemorial traditions. The problem of the conflict between the Government of Mexico and the representatives of the Catholic Church, is one of these; it is a problem not of yesterday, but of centuries past.

The Church, the Catholic Church, was, from the time of the Roman Emperor Constantine until the Reformation, an organic part of the structure of the civil state of every Christian nation in the world. King or emperor was crowned by the ministers of the Church, nor did he feel the throne secure under him until the sacred oil had touched his forehead and his breast. Even in the dawn of the nineteenth century, a Corsican genius must need seek to secure this form of sanction for his crown, Napoleon's wisdom recognizing how deeply it was embodied in the traditions of the nations of the world. Kings might at

times rebel against ecclesiastical authority, yet never dared ultimately to challenge it. They recognized in it, and in the Church, the binding force which held together the social organism of which they were the heads. The Church was the teacher of youth, the guardian of the poor, the warden of orphans, the sanctuary of the persecuted, the spiritual organization which, recognizing no difference between the soul of prince and serf, provided the checks and counterpoises in the social structure composed of crown, nobles and commoners, which held each group in adjustment and eased the friction that otherwise must have frayed them into anarchy and mutual destruction. To this day, a quaint survival of the days of faith, bishops sit in the House of Lords in England's Parliament.

If this historic significance of the rôle of the Catholic Church can be comprehended, many historical facts, otherwise liable to be misinterpreted, automatically fall into their proper place. For instance, in these days the State pursues unhesitatingly and punishes righteously, upheld by the full force of public opinion, any man guilty of seditious propaganda within its army or its fleet, and it does this because the State considers that it is its right and its duty to defend the nation against the agents of anarchy. With this comparison, it surely should not be difficult to understand that no less firmly did our forefathers believe that they possessed the right and the obligation to suppress and punish the heretic whose preachings were necessarily directed against the force which bound together and united the very State itself, the Catholic Church. If such conceptions as these can be clearly grasped, the modern problem of Church and State in Mexico, inherited from this ancient order of things, can the better be understood.

The Catholic Church in Mexico was, from the time of the Conquest, an essential part of the social order implanted by Spain. Spain loosed the sword upon the unfortunate land, unleashed against it armies of "Conquistadores" who left their own land in a spirit of high adventure, mingled with the passion for the speedy acquisition of wealth; but Spain also tempered with a certain mercy her policy towards the subject races, whose evangelization she held it her mission to be. Amid the exploitation of the helpless Indian by her sons, the voice of the Crown of Spain was lifted again and again, threatening penalties and imposing drastic punishment in order to restrain the seemingly insatiable lust of the conquerors. And, ever prompting the monarchy to this course, ever pleading

with it for regulations and decrees which might cast protection over the helpless natives, were the representatives of the Church.

The Dominican Friar, Bartolomé de las Casas, fearlessly sent forth denunciations of the cruelty of his countrymen, flinging himself into the defence of the Indian with the zeal of a fanatic, bombarding the monarchs of Spain with his petitions, defiant of threats, reckless of consequences, so only that he might acquit himself of the duty which he had undertaken on behalf of the subject race. Less renowned, but even more truly constructive of permanent benefit to the Indians, were those Franciscan friars who came to New Spain immediately after the conquest, men who lived among the Indian communities in poverty and humility, to help them in the struggle with life, and to prepare them for a better eternity than that of their cruel and bloody gods. Zumarraga, first Archbishop of Mexico, and many a worthy successor, fought valiantly in defence of the Indians and sought to educate and assist them.

There were qualities of grandness in these dauntless missionaries which are not excelled by the military fame of the conquerors themselves. Turning their eyes for ever from their beloved Spain and renouncing hope of comfort, affection and human consolation, they lived lives of hardship upon the frontiers of the Spanish zone of influence, until the earth of their adopted land claimed their weary bodies. Beloved of the Indians, their memory lives to-day in remote village and town, the Indian clings to his rude notions of the faith imparted to him, even though often ignorant of the Spanish tongue. And Mexico, even anti-Catholic, official Mexico to-day, remembers these men as their greatest benefactors. Gante Street, one of the main thoroughfares of the capital, has been allowed to hold the name which it derived from Fray Pedro de Gante, Motolinía Street, that derived from Fray Toribio de Motolinía, whilst all other streets around have been stripped of their old identity and ancient names. And the latest statue, the only one in nigh a score of years erected by the Government of Mexico, shows the gaunt, uplifted features of Fray Bartolomé de las Casas.

The Church in Mexico, entrusted by the Spanish Crown with a special mission, namely that of giving a spiritual character to the conquest and control of the peoples of the new world, acquired in time, as a necessary means of defence and survival in her stern and bitter struggle for the Indian races of which she was the defender, privileges and prerogatives which gave

her a position of unusual strength and wealth in the Colony. This wealth was reinforced by the pious donations of the faithful in every generation, donations which caused a progressive accumulation of temporal possessions in the hands of the Church, the more so that ecclesiastical thrift was in notable contrast to the almost universal tendency among the lay elements in the colony to stake upon any venture, to dissipate in a frontier expedition, a night's session at cards or a scheme of revolt, all of the creole's swiftly accumulated wealth. It was as inevitable that the prudent hands of the Church should accumulate vast wealth in the new territories, as it was that the old Dutch families of tenacious habit should become vastly wealthy as the owners of sections of land upon which grew the City of New York. Neither process was immoral, although both may have been in the result unfortunate.

Therefore, the eighteenth century found the Church in Mexico vastly wealthy and strongly entrenched behind the privileges of tradition and of law. Yet, lest the impression be erroneously formed that she became submerged in the ease of wealth and love of power to the oblivion of her spiritual mission, it may be pointed out that it was in this very century that the barefooted friars founded and formed those missions which reach in the territory of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific, surviving still in Texas, New Mexico, and California as one of the highest and purest expressions of a spiritual ideal in the tradition of the American people. These missions were founded at the time when the Established Church in England—aye, and the Catholic Church in France for that matter—had sunk to a most perilously low moral level and to almost complete forgetfulness of their spiritual mission. Historical perspective, we repeat, must not be lost, as too frequently it has been, in judging of the acts of the Catholic Church in Mexico. That the Church had become very wealthy in the eighteenth century and used at least some of her wealth in God's direct service, is manifest to-day in the vast number of churches erected or sumptuously decorated in that century. But we cannot deny that this wealth produced a certain degree of corruption, and diverted much of the energy of the ministers of God from their proper purpose and mission. Even so, it was not so much her wealth as her traditional position in the social organism of the State which later put the Church out of date in a modern Mexico. The Church emerged into the nineteenth century enormously wealthy and enormously



powerful, her wealth well ministered for the most part and for the benefit of the masses, and her power mostly beneficent—and, under the existing social order, a necessary part of the political organism of the Colony. But now there began to stir in the Mexican people the same desire that half a century before resulted in the United States, a desire for freedom from European tutelage. It is not to be forgotten that the first leaders in this movement for Mexican Independence, Hidalgo and Morelos, the most renowned of Mexican patriots, were priests of the Church.

But the Church authorities themselves, clinging to their traditional mission from the Crown of Spain, instinctively ranged their influence on the side of what was then the established law and order of things, and they were, at times by active partisan effort, hostile to the effort for liberation from Spain. It demanded, indeed, an extraordinary, or rather an impossible, prescience on the part of any individual or group at that time, to visualize in the turbulent outbursts, frequent betrayals and crude license of the rebels, the dawning of a spirit of independence and national consciousness, and well may ecclesiastics have sighed, and on occasions striven, for the renewal of those binding forces without which the State would become, apparently for ever, the prey of a succession of adventurers, and be at times threatened with complete dissolution in anarchy.

This attitude was the more justified that the attaining of independence from Spain found the Mexican people wholly unprepared to exercise the functions of a free community, still dominated by the instinct of acceptance of tutelage, in contrast to the American colonies, where the robust spirit of self-government had been developed prior to actual revolt. In independent Mexico after 1822 the powers of State passed from hand to hand, the sport of political ambitions of the time, the spoil of the individual controlling for the moment the strongest military power. It is hardly to be wondered that the Church, amid such apparently meaningless turmoil, where the basest passions were often only too manifest, exposed herself to the charge of being the opponent of independence and liberalism, the last manifestation of this political tendency being given by her sympathy with the ambition of the hapless Emperor Maximilian, in the vain hope that he might be able to consolidate the lost energies and disrupted organism of the State. Maximilian fell in the year 1867 and, with the crumbling of the old idea of the State, the Catholic Church in

Mexico, in regard to her temporal power and possessions, at last stood revealed as the surviving relic of a bygone age. Monarchy had been routed, imperialism had vanished like a dream, ancient custom and privilege, title and tithe, were being swept away, and the political mission of the Church, her task of cementing and upholding the old civil organization, had for the time disappeared. She stood, in her temporal power and possessions, like some huge buttress which still rears itself, gaunt and purposeless, over the plain, after the ancient walls and edifice, which it was its task to sustain, have disappeared.

It was natural that there was a realization of this by the radical heads of the Mexican State, now stirring with ideas of liberty and democracy. It was natural that there was political hatred and distrust for this great mass which now cumbered space without supporting anything, which absorbed energy without giving out strength, which was opposed to programmes of reform. It was inevitable that a new form of government, elaborated outside the Church, should regard her temporal power, privilege and possessions as wholly out of place and even useless. A finer sense of justice would, while relegating the Church to the spiritual sphere, have respected her rights of property in so far as they were employed in the service of God and the community. But revolutionaries are generally extremists. The Church had to go the way of the State with which it had been so closely connected. She could not be immediately destroyed, but henceforth her power for good was grievously crippled. To charge against her the backward state of the Mexican people and say that, in her centuries of spiritual monopoly in Mexico, she failed to act worthily of her mission is to lose sight of historical facts. It is unfair to-day, for instance, to criticize the Catholic Church for the ignorance of the Indian population when for seventy years the liberal governments of Mexico have been hampering the power of the Church, confiscating her places of worship, breaking up her humanitarian institutions, seizing her orphanages, schools and hospitals, and thwarting her ever-organized effort for good. There were, in fact, more of Catholic hospitals and orphanages in Mexico at the dawn of the nineteenth century, in proportion to the inhabitants, than there were of similar institutions in Great Britain. There were proportionally more universities in Mexico and more students in them ; there was, strange to say, a higher proportion of literacy in the Colony, a lower proportion of illiterates, than in the England of that time.

Judged then, by the only standard, that of the eighteenth century, which can fairly be applied to the work of the Catholic Church in Mexico in that century, she may be criticized for not having availed herself of her exceptional strength to do more for the people, but at least she did more than did the Christian organizations in other lands for their flocks. The clergy's conception of the mission of education was not the modern one; their ideas naturally in those times, were patriarchal and protective, not democratic and progressive. Religion they taught first—prayer, the use of the Sacraments, the Commandments, obedience to the Church and State; secondly, the boy of the poorer classes was educated to his trade, the girl to her domestic task. Education was not then interpreted as "uplift," as affording an equal opportunity to all, but as being the equipping of the individual for the best discharge of his duties and the utmost efficiency in the sphere to which he had been born; an ancient theory, a past order of things, but Church authorities are not more to be criticized for their patriarchal interpretation of the proper social order than is the vicar's wife in England of only a few decades back, for her worthy ministrations to the poor, although to-day, their fashion would be offensive and intolerable.

The representative of the change in social ideas who struck at the power and possessions of the Church in the middle of the last century, was Benito Juarez, a pure-blooded Indian, with the uncompromising spirit and fanatical fixity of purpose of his race. It was he who refused to commute the death sentence of the Emperor Maximilian to any less bloody form of political reprisal. Juarez refused reprieve, not out of a blood-thirsty instinct, but quite typically because of his rigid conception of inexorable justice. A greater statesman and a broader mind would have seen the wisdom of not exacting retribution in a manner which has prejudiced the mind of the world against Mexico from the date when Maximilian's blood stained the ground of the Cerro de las Campanas at Queretaro. Benito Juarez, President of Mexico at last, implacably resolute, narrowly determined, his soul embittered by years of fugitive existence, by persecution and the imminent danger of death, having crushed the old Imperialism, turned with the fury of vindictive justice to despoil and destroy the power of the Church, which he identified with his other foe. Even before the Maximilian interlude the so-called Laws of Reform had been launched against the Church by Juarez's political party in the year 1856, a fact which forced the Church in self-defence to support the

conservative and reactionary programme of Maximilian. It had now to suffer the consequences.

The Laws of Reform, better called Penal Laws, like all measures born of passion and prejudice, went to the utmost extremes in attacking the power and influence of Catholicism in Mexico. The Church lands and properties, estates, buildings, funds and minor possessions were confiscated to the State, not, as in other countries on the basis of a Concordat, but outright and without the shadow of compensation. Not alone were those properties sequestered which ecclesiastics held for revenue, but also those devoted to educational or humanitarian use, and even the sacred edifices themselves were declared forfeit with all their contents, their ornaments, their vestments and their consecrated vessels. The Government seized everything; many churches were pillaged and closed: some were sold, some dedicated to public and profane uses. Vast quantities of objects of art and intrinsic value disappeared, and some were carried off to the museums and galleries of the State. Hospitals, almshouses, orphanages, schools and seminaries conducted by religious bodies, were seized, and the communities which conducted them expelled or broken up. Liberalism indeed had its revenge, for Juarez hacked and hewed at the very foundations of the Church. From his time the Catholic Church has ceased to play any part in the Mexican Government or to possess political power.

It has been estimated by different writers that, prior to this period, the Church held title to a fifth of the land of the Republic. All of these estates were confiscated by the Government. What of education, what of humanitarian effort, might not have been accomplished with these resources which the State absorbed and which, rightly administered by the same, might have saved Mexico from her problem of illiteracy, ignorance and poverty of to-day. It is hardly fair to criticize the Church for these conditions when it is the State itself which, for seventy years, has held, or rather dissipated those accumulations of ecclesiastical wealth which were intended for, and should have been dedicated to, the service of the people.

In all human affairs tolerance succeeds to the heat of partisan passion, and responsibility mellows the point of view even of the revolutionary politician, become administrator. Throughout the long reign of Porfirio Diaz, who came to power after the death of Juarez in 1877, although these Penal Laws were never withdrawn, nor the Church possessions, nor the churches them-

selves, ever restored by the State, the officers of the Government connived at the re-organized existence of collegiate schools, seminaries, convents, orphanages and hospitals under nuns or brothers, realizing that the constructive moral influence of such foundations was desirable for the State, now that they had ceased to be or to seem the emissaries of a hostile political power. Excellent, but little known, work was being done in Mexico, as in every other country of the world, by religious communities, largely leavened by devoted men and women of foreign nationality, French, Spanish and Irish for the most part. So worthily were these religious labouring for their ideals that even the sons and daughters of the Radicals of Government and Cabinet fame were almost invariably committed to these communities to be taught and educated.

Far from possessing wealth, the Mexican Church under the conditions of the last seventy-five years, has been submerged in poverty, a poverty all the more marked for existing in the very shadow of its great possessions of the past. The Bishops of the Church have been men of high character and qualifications, but their task is one of great difficulty. The breaking up and suspension of ecclesiastical seminaries has caused priests to be prematurely assigned to the care of souls who had neither the training nor the character nor the energy for this mission. The morality of the secular clergy, scattered throughout the country, and remote from episcopal control, the same control frequently broken by the flight and absence of persecuted prelates, has left much to be desired. Fanaticism, too, has made a strong survival among the inscrutable Indians,<sup>1</sup> largely due to inadequate teaching and religious instruction. With them, the externals of religion only too often cover strange thoughts and traditions reaching back to ancient gods, so tenacious and unrevealing is the Indian mind, and in this particular also the Mexican Church is not above reproach, though criticism must be tempered, as we have shown, by the memory of the intolerable interference of the State with her lawful activities.

However, its poverty alone suffices to proclaim its political impotence. In nigh a decade of intermittent revolutions, over a period which from 1911 onwards has seen eleven different Presidents in Mexico, and fifty different political banners in strife, the Church never gave its name or sanction to any man

<sup>1</sup> Nearly 40 per cent of the population are pure Indians and about the same percentage half-caste: the rest being of European descent.

or movement. The so-called Catholic Party is politically a nebulous body, an expression of moral purpose rather than of political programme. To speak of this impoverished and weakened organization, with its pastors frequently persecuted and exiled, as having exercised political power within present memory, is absurd to anyone with knowledge of Mexico.

On the other hand, to assert that the Church exerts great indirect influence, and that this influence must necessarily reach into political spheres, is manifestly correct. Mexico is, nominally at least, Catholic, in about the same sense in which other countries are nominally Christian. But a Catholic, in the practising sense, the average Mexican hardly is, for the moral law is stern and exacting and few care to fulfil it. We may say that amongst few peoples is Catholic practice so weak and Catholic tradition so relatively strong.

It is in this tradition, and the undefinable force which it represents, that the problem of the Radical Government of Mexico rests. This Government is confronted, not, as that of the United States, by a score of different, dissident Christian creeds, but by one creed alone, under one group of pastors. Lacking direct political force, it is nevertheless obvious that a religious organization so homogeneous, must be a body with which a Government has to reckon and which it might even fear, and the present Government of Mexico, which would re-model the social order, re-draw the lines between the classes, redistribute property, a Government extremely socialistic in fact, is at every turn faced by a vast elusive, impalpable influence in the realm of ideas which it does not nor can control. The Government has acted under a sense of exasperation felt at this stubborn thwarting of its purposes, and of the socialistic programme of which it is the exponent; and the Catholic tradition, on the other hand, is necessarily antagonistic in instinct, if not in act, to an ancient enemy—the social theory which would constitute the State ultimately as the sole arbiter of culture, thought and belief in a people.

Here comes the need of our making some kind of appraisal of the Government, as we have already done of the Church in this country. A Mexican Government exists in power, not by the will and choice of the people, democratically expressed, but by the latter's acquiescence in it, due to mere tolerance or to fear. A predominantly uneducated, ignorant mass like the Mexican people, heavily weighed down by the irresponsibility of character of the Indian race, a people of which probably a



fifth can speak only Indian dialects, and certainly not more than half of whom can read and write, which, as a mass has no tradition of the duties of citizenship, no habit of self-government, incapable of coherent thought and articulate expression, lacking even an elementary geographical conception of the significance of nationality—such a people cannot select, through democratic process and form, its own Government and President.

It is therefore in no spirit of criticism of the present, or of other Governments of Mexico, that it is stated that they are not derived from the people, but that they have imposed themselves and their ideas upon the people. Now, transmission of power from Government to Government, from President to President-elect, can be effected in peace only when the former has control over and concurs in the election of the latter. No Government or President of Mexico would permit of their being followed in power by an opposition party, or would allow such a party apparently to win at the polls, for each Government conceives itself to be the sole depository of the spirit of true patriotism and highest national interest.

This perpetuating of a political party in power until it is removed by shock of arms, and the controlling of elections to cause its continual and successive choice by the people, is not so much immoral on the part of the Mexican administrators as it is absolutely inevitable in the circumstances. They are compelled to throw their troops and adherents around the polling booths as the necessary means of appeasing the fetish of democratic formulæ in a country not yet ready for democracy, and in which, if the uncontrolled expression of every man's will were frankly stated, there would rage such a pandemonium of ignorance, there would be such a shrieking of demagogues stampeding the excited people this way and that, as would swamp any form of Government. It is the democratic theory itself—the modern conception of the need and right of every man, regardless of his aptitude, being privileged to exercise an equal vote—that is here at fault, and not, in truth, the Government which gets out of a certain constitutional *impasse* by force, the only means possible to it. The marvel is that, resting upon such a foundation, and so unsusceptible of any control by public opinion, the Government of Mexico is a Government at all, and not that it falls so far below the level of integrity and ability revealed in other countries under more favourable conditions.



The difficulties of the Mexican Government are therefore those which are inherent in its origin : of its very nature, and as a necessary measure of survival, it is arbitrary and dogmatic. In the neighbouring republic of the United States, the government derives from the people as the peak of a pyramid from its base ; by a process of selection and elimination, possible only in a nation bred to a tradition of democracy, the authority at Washington does approximately represent the average national aspiration. With no such constructive material available, a Government in the United States of Mexico, although performing the ritual of similar democratic forms, never interprets its mission to be that of expressing the will of the electorate, since such has never been voiced, but that of imposing upon the people those theories and principles which, as part of its political creed, it judges to be best for the nation.

It is beside the purpose here to discuss the merits and demerits of the programme of advanced socialism which the Calles Government is attempting to apply in the conviction of its being the depository of the leadership of the Mexican people. The outstanding, and recognized, fact is that the regime of General Calles does stand for an advanced form of socialism, in many ways closer to the practice of Soviet Russia than to any democratic theory. At the same time, it should be stated that the Calles Government, whatever the criticism of its political creed and method, has set a higher standard of integrity and has shown a greater determination to conserve the national resources and to advance the welfare of the masses, according to its own theories, than any recent Mexican regime. To compare the intellectual and moral standards of this Government with those obtaining in other contemporary Governments, under more favourable social and political conditions, would be manifestly unfair ; to compare the Calles Government with other previous Mexican Governments is to recognize a certain advance in political steadfastness and sincerity of purpose. It is the greater pity that it does not realize how much easier it is to destroy than to rebuild, and how fatal it must be to deprive a whole nation of the sanctions and consolations afforded by religion without having anything effective to put in their place.

The present quarrel between the Calles Government and the Mexican Church came about in the following manner : The Government tried about a year ago to create a state-controlled

religion by encouraging certain reprobate priests to seize different Catholic churches, and sustaining them therein and in their ministrations of religion in defiance of the Catholic authorities. The mov  failed, largely through the notorious character of the schismatic clergy so employed. Its failure has been followed by a succession of other blows, struck by the Government against the Church, this time in the name of the Mexican Constitution of 1917. As all the actions of the Government against the Church have invoked the Constitution in question, it becomes necessary to explain the nature of this document, for it is on its enactments as applied by the Government that the so-called religious conflict consists. Compare it with the Constitution of the U.S.A. In that case one venerable document represents, not so much the prescience and ingenuity of its authors, as their wise expression of the hitherto uninterpreted aspirations of an instinctively democratic and law-abiding people. On the other hand, it is a matter of history that this is the last of seven Constitutions framed and applied in Mexico, almost within the span of a century, each differing substantially from its predecessors and representing successive changes in political theory.

In 1917, rifle still in hand and the civil war in which he triumphed still smouldering throughout the Republic, Venustiano Carranza gathered an assembly for the drafting of a new Constitution. In the call by which the constituents were convened, all those were expressly excluded who might not be of the same political creed as that professed by the dominant, Carranza party. The resultant document, never submitted to popular referendum or national vote, reveals the handicraft of politicians steeped in the bitterness of class war, and of idealists, chanting ecstatically theories which they had had no opportunity to test and temper by the sobering experience of responsibility in power. Into this Constitution were incorporated the penal laws of Juarez to which reference has already been made. Juarez, himself, had wisely never sought to write these repressive enactments into his Constitution of 1857, regarding them as being, like martial law, measures of emergency to meet the passing condition that was created by the power and possessions and the political influences of the Church at that time ; but, this power and these possessions gone, the years from 1857 to 1917 found most of these laws a dead letter, although they were incorporated constitutionally in 1872.

The anti-clerical fanatics of 1917, however, were determined to rewrite them into their Constitution, with the addition of other prescriptions so ruthless that no one ventured to apply them till Calles assumed power.

This famous Constitution of 1917 has been printed out, summarily or in full, in so many papers that it need not be repeated here. We need only note the aim and object of certain anti-religious articles. By Article 3 education in all its branches, private as well as public, is entirely secularized. No teacher or book or emblem having any connection with religion is allowed. By Article 5 all religious Orders are outlawed. By Article 27 no other organizations, whatever their aim, charitable, social, scientific, or what not, may be in charge of any religious corporation or individual. No such bodies may acquire or hold any real property; moreover, all property of whatever kind now vested in such corporations is declared forfeit to the State. This includes, according to the previous article, all Church buildings, schools, convents, seminaries, etc., of which the Government, Federal or State, assumes the dominion and administration exclusively. For the public service, Article 24 asserts complete Government control and supervision of all public worship, and Article 26 declares all Churches, actually existing or to be erected, to be the property of the nation to be used for whatever purpose the Government may decide. Finally, lest any vitality should be left in the unhappy Mexican Church, Article 130 allows each State to determine how many ministers of religion should be tolerated within its borders—(the State of Tabasco in the spirit of that article has limited the number to zero!)—and excludes all foreign clerics, whilst depriving the native clergy of the right to vote or to inherit except from blood relations, or to criticize even constitutionally, any detail of this penal legislation!

Out of these clauses in the 1917 Constitution has arisen the present conflict between Church and State. If it be considered that these clauses, in their literal enactment, are just, wholesome and consonant with the principles of liberty, then the Government of General Calles is justified; but if these clauses reveal a spirit of injustice, of unwholesome restriction by the State of religious aspirations, and of violation of the liberty of the individual, then the President of Mexico, his Ministers at home and abroad, are begging the issue every time that they declare that all they require of the Church is that she obey the Law.

There is nothing sacro-sanct about a man-made law ; there is no justice in a law that abrogates elementary human rights like the right of conscience : there is no validity in a law which violates the Law of God. The official apologists for the action of the present Calles Government have first to justify the 1917 Constitution. For it is within the Mexican Law itself, not to be cited as the tablets of Sinai but as a human document susceptible of error and discussion, that the right or wrong of the case lies.

The Catholic bishops in an open pastoral letter protested against the manner in which the Government, in the early part of the present year, began to enforce these dormant penal laws. The Pope, in an encyclical, also raised his voice in protest. Both pleaded for constitutional amendment by constitutional means ; both proclaimed obedience to the laws so far as the same might be compatible with conscience, but not beyond ; both pleaded for justice and for peace. These messages infuriated the radicals of the Government, and were qualified as treasonable and incendiary under Article 130.

Then, in punishment of the spirit revealed by the Church heads, the grinding force of the Constitution was brought to bear. All foreign priests were expelled, and all religious communities, regardless of the interruption of their mission, whether conducting schools, orphanages, hospitals or other beneficent work, were seized and closed and the inmates scattered. Much needless brutality, such as night raids by military on the establishments of women, added to the vindictiveness and hardship of the expulsions and confiscations, and the scholars, sick or orphans, inmates of the establishments, were frequently deprived overnight of their only succour, and set adrift.

Again rose lamentation and protest from the Catholic prelates, and indignant, but still pacific, protest from the Catholic community, and again, in requital for this attitude of "insubordination" and "rebellion," fell the heavy hand of the penal laws, now weighted with the utmost metal of their iron clauses. Nor were there lacking indications that the Government realized, even while denying it, the underlying gravity of the conflict that it had provoked. By presidential decree the press was silenced : the "Universal," the greatest daily of Mexico, was constrained to publish, for the satisfaction of its readers, the explanation that it could no longer print news or comment on the religious question, as discussion of

the same would cause it to be suspended under the new decree, pointing out at the same time, though a non-sectarian paper, that the same decree violated the freedom of the press proclaimed in the very Constitution that the Government professed.

And so the press says nothing of the persecution, being muzzled and afraid, but from hand to hand pass furtively the pamphlets of the new Catholic League, now organized for the defence of religion and managing to survive, though its heads have been, in swift succession, arrested and clapped into prison ; always have there been others to step forward to their place and peril. And, day by day, on every lip, in every place wherever two men meet, rich or poor, Catholic or free-thinker, there is but one topic, one question—and no answer. The happenings in the provinces that the papers dare not tell, pass from mouth to mouth and grow in the telling. And there is uneasiness and restlessness and furtive discontent such as there has not been for many years in Mexico, and everywhere fear, and the dread of news of violence, where feeling runs so high and repression is so fierce. This very article has had to be smuggled out of Mexico, and it must be anonymous because its writer if discovered would without trial, be expelled instantly from the Republic.

On July 2nd, the President made retort to the determined Catholic attitude of protest by issuing a new code of laws, increasing the proscriptions of the Constitution and weighting them with definite prison sentences for the different offences. Any member of a religious community, for instance, although not living in community, but merely for the offence of taking common vows and obeying common rules of life, is to be punished by one to two years of imprisonment, women to receive two-thirds of the male sentence. Any ecclesiastic criticizing publicly or in private the Law or the Constitution is liable to six years' imprisonment. All parochial clergy must register with the State, after the manner of Government officials, the reason being given that the Government must know and control these priests as being in charge of State-owned (confiscated) churches.

This latter " law " brought the stubborn conflict to a climax, the Catholic bishops ordering their priests to withdraw from the churches rather than submit to State administration and control. The socialist State now holds the open but empty churches, where the timid faithful drift in and out and gaze at

the empty altars. Once again the patient Church has evaded the attempted plan of absorption that, after the expulsion of the religious communities, would have brought the secular clergy under State control.

In one way alone has the Catholic body struck back at its tormentor. A Catholic League of boycott has been formed against all luxuries and amusements, all avoidable purchase and expenditure of any kind, with the avowed object of slowly paralysing business and thus, by reflex action, is bringing pressure to bear upon the unrelenting Government. Evading the dragooning, too elusive to permit of repressive action by direct measures, the movement has spread and is making itself generally felt. The Government of General Calles finds itself much in the position of a bull that has gored a hornets' nest, and now must stay and fight the elusive creatures, because pride forbids retreat. It claims that it has deserved well of the nation, that it has sought the national welfare even at its own peril, has balanced the budget, has made payments against old debts, has accumulated reserves, has valiantly defended the interests of the citizens and that these therefore should rally to it in its need; and many a "liberal" citizen of Mexico does feel the force of that claim—the need that there is to defeat that subtle, black-frocked crowd, a state within the State, that would, they think, again thwart progress and delay prosperity.

So all through the land as in the days of the French or Russian "Terror," there is suppressed tension and apprehension, heightened by the abolition of freedom of speech and news: there is a sullen muttering of old hatreds and mistrusts, and the fear of an open clash between powers that find themselves in positions from which neither can recede. The Government has raised the rallying-cry of patriotism against this cloud, risen, like the genii of fable from the heedlessly opened bottle, but is baffled to find that its thrusts and slashes cut only smoke. Rome and the bishops counsel patience, and prudence and peace, but can the prelates indefinitely hold their followers to the middle path of refraining from violence, yet remaining staunch under the hardship of the long siege that has commenced? Time alone will show, but there is no need for time to realize that Mexico alone, without foreign intervention, must solve her own problem. Foreign interference would be as unhappy in the outcome as was ten years ago the intrusion of



the white armies in Russia, and nothing should be done from without that may further embitter the strife that, being a conflict between ultimate things is already bitter enough. The depth and breadth of this bitterness has to be sensed to be appreciated—the uneasy, stifled voice of a large mass of public opinion and sentiment, the shuffling of restless feet under the vigilant guard of the Government, its troops and its organized-labour allies. The muffled sound of this struggle between Socialism and Church is fraught with all the uncertainty of a struggle in the dark.

Happy if there be no rupture of the public peace, of the peace that the prelates are preaching ; but Mexico, with its tradition of the ultimate adjustment of all questions by the arbitrament of the sword, is apprehensive of bloodshed, and the condottorei of Mexico, the restless and ambitious soldiers of fortune and enemies of any Government, caring nothing for the Church, would clutch at its banner, at any banner, so that they might rise in revolt. Still, the counsel of prudence, the policy of the heads of the Church of peaceful resistance, may, and should, prevail. It would have a better chance if the Government were less provocative, but this is Mexico and methods of passion alone are understood. There is at least this phenomenon manifest, that of a passionate public issue being wrestled out without appeal to armed revolt and, for us who know Mexico and have read her story, this alone marks great progress in the difficult path of true self-government—by self-control. The meek, we are promised, shall inherit the earth.



## IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA

### II..

TWO days, crowded as they were, could not exhaust the interest of Washington, which is of importance not only as the federal capital of the States but as the seat of two Catholic Universities. Its mundane glories were glimpsed during rapid motor-drives—especially the beauties of Potomac Park, reclaimed from the river and connecting by a belt of waving green and blazoned flower-beds the Capitol, the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and commanding, far off across the stream, a view of the heights of Arlington whereon lie the National Cemetery, the Memorial Amphitheatre and the tomb of the Unknown Soldier: a vista unparalleled for spaciousness and grace—the first of which brought me to Georgetown University buildings, clustered on the high north bank of the Potomac, on the outskirts of the old city of Georgetown which flourished when Washington was a swamp but now has been incorporated in the capital as West Washington. The University celebrated its first centenary in 1889: it was founded after the United States were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Vicar-Apostolic of the London District and just before its founder, the celebrated John Carroll, became first Bishop of Baltimore, with jurisdiction over all the former English colonies, a diocese of 3 million square miles. Bishop Carroll had been a Jesuit for 20 years before the suppression of the Society in 1773, and, although American born, had worked mainly in Belgium. After the suppression he returned to his native Maryland, and around his zealous personality the early fortunes of the Church in the States for a long time centred. He was consecrated Bishop by the Vicar-Apostolic of the Western District, Bishop Walmesley, at Lulworth Castle in Dorset. When the Society was restored in America in 1805, Georgetown, then a simple Academy, was formally placed under the direction of the Jesuits, many of whom had been already concerned in its establishment. It was authorized by Congress to confer degrees in secular subjects in 1815, and by the Holy See in 1833 to confer degrees in philosophy and theology. Only

in 1844 was it incorporated by Act of Congress as Georgetown College. The number of registered students at present exceeds 2,400: twenty years ago there were less than a third of that total. It is still growing: an immense new wing was nearing completion when I was there, and yet the authorities have to lament a lack of sufficient space. In its archives, museums and libraries are to be found a priceless collection of documents and relics, connected with the early history of the States and of the Church in the States, admirably arranged by a venerable Father, Henry Shandelle, not long dead, who devoted his declining years to the work. A lordly underground, fire-proof muniment-room harbours records innumerable for the future historian, whilst the library includes a bequest of the books of a past historian, J. Gilmary Shea, left to the University on his death and unique as a mine of historical material. The law and medical faculties of the University are in the city, as also is a faculty, which Georgetown, I think, has the honour of inaugurating, the School of Foreign Service, founded in 1919, to train students for diplomatic and consular employment. The present Dean, Fr. Edmund Walsh, may be said to practise what he preaches, for he has been employed several times by the Holy See in missions to Soviet Russia. We can imagine no better preparation for the war of wits and the clash of ideals and interests which mark the intercourse of the nations than the thorough grounding in Catholic ethics that forms part of this course. Already during the seven years of its existence a fair number of "Bachelorates of Foreign Service" have been conferred.

Georgetown is separated from Washington proper by Rock Creek, a small tributary of the Potomac, which runs from the north through a beautifully-wooded ravine of its own making, reserved as a public park. Many of the ambassadorial residences are to be found in its neighbourhood, and about ten miles out lies Garrett Park, where there is a new Preparatory School for Georgetown College, a plain enough brick building in the Colonial style, but, inside, the last word in up-to-date equipment, each scholar having a separate room. Before visiting this I was motored across to Virginia to inspect the National Graveyard at Arlington—wherein is preserved the old home of the Southern leader, General Lee, and which is crowded with the graves of those who fell in the Civil War, North and South, with additions due to later

conflicts. On the highest point has been erected a large but finely proportioned amphitheatre wherein the President speaks on Memorial Day, and on the terrace in front of which is placed the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, ever guarded by living sentries. A dinner in Washington with Mr. Thomas Woodlock, an old Beaumont boy and now an important official in the Federal Government, fittingly ended a day full of charming impressions.

Next day, under the guidance of Mr. Edward Donnelly, S.J., Lecturer in Journalism at the University, I pursued my inspection of the city and surroundings, visiting first the headquarters of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, a full account of the object and activities of which appeared in *THE MONTH* for March of last year, from the pen of Fr. Siedenbureg, of Chicago. It is an organization intended to co-ordinate all the public action of the 102 dioceses of the United States in matters of national concern, such as education and social reform—an immense yet necessary enterprise if the Faith was to have its due effect in leavening society. Different prelates preside over its various sections, and the Executive Department in Washington supervises the whole and acts as a medium of communication between the Catholic authorities and the Federal and the various State Governments. It maintains a News Service which has for clients papers all over the world. Fr. Burke, chief of the Executive, and Fr. John A. Ryan, the noted economist, kindly showed us over the premises, which employ a staff of assistants nearly 100 in number!, and seemed a very hive of industry. We are bound to admit, however, that we met, up and down the country, a certain amount of criticism of the N.C.W.C. as not being thoroughly representative of Catholic opinion in some of its *démarches*. Considering the vastness of the country and the multiplicity of interests to be considered such criticism is naturally inevitable, but since the N.C.W.C. is wholly subordinated to the hierarchy in all its activities it cannot, we imagine, go very far astray, and its positive benefits seem far to outweigh those incidental drawbacks. We have nothing like it here, and perhaps it is not needed in this small land, but if the National Congress Committee, which is composed of representatives of all the recognized Catholic Societies, were to remain in permanent Session with a programme, an office, an Executive and a staff it would somewhat resemble the N.C.W.C.

Our next visit was to the Washington Monument, an immense marble obelisk in which are inserted stones from each of the States, and which is 55 ft. square and 555 ft. in height, and the singularly graceful Lincoln memorial, a marble temple with Doric columns enshrining French's famous seated statue. Then we crossed to "ole Virginny" to visit Mount Vernon, Washington's old mansion on the banks of the Potomac, some sixteen miles south of the city. Hither the Father of his country retired after laying down the Presidency in 1797, and here he spent the last two years of his life in a modest frame-house, overlooking from wooded bluffs long and lovely reaches of the Potomac which here runs east and west. It is of course a national monument, and everything is kept just as it was left a century and a quarter ago. In the trim-kept grounds stands the vault where Washington and his wife are buried, and in Alexandria, the nearest town, one is shown, in Christ Church, the pew in which the Washington family worshipped and in which, at the kindly instance of the verger, one may actually sit! Washington was a Mason, at a time when Masonic activities were not so equivocal as they have since become, and in a neighbouring Lodge are preserved a large number of relics and pictures connected with the great man. It was, by the way, the neglect of Alexandria by Congress in the early days that prompted Virginia to rescind in 1846 its grant of territory to the Federal Government and thus to spoil the symmetry of the District of Colombia.

Returning from Mount Vernon we remained on the Virginia side and passed Washington again on our way to the Falls of the Potomac, a lovely piece of forest and river scenery, some ten or twelve miles to the north. The falls, which are in three not very lofty stages, must be impressive enough in the winter floods: in mid-June they were mostly grey rock. On the way back we crossed into Maryland again, and inspected the Episcopal Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul in course of erection on Mount St. Alban. Not much has yet been built, but judging from the plans it will be of immense size and great beauty, resembling in general design the Cathedral of Wells. In the portion open for worship are the tombs of General Dewey, of Manilla fame, and of President Wilson, that hapless man who, had his wisdom equalled his eloquence and his foresight been as far-ranging as his obstinacy and self-assurance, might have reformed the world.

If all the nation's great men are to be buried here in future, the Cathedral authorities will need to guard against the misfortune\* that has befallen historic Westminster.

The last event in a crowded day was a visit, under the guidance of Fr. McGowan, of the N.C.W.C., to the Catholic University of America, which was founded by the Hierarchy in 1889 under pontifical sanction. It is still growing, and presents a unique feature in that many religious Orders have erected in its grounds noviciates and houses of study which form an integral part of the University. A special College for the teaching of religious women, under, I think, the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, is also reckoned part. At any rate, the Sisters have a magnificent establishment there, which boasts a large chapel dedicated to the Trinity which is one of the gems of ecclesiastical architecture in the States. Time allowed only a visit to the future Basilica of the Immaculate Conception, of which the crypt alone has been at present constructed:—itself a large and impressive church rich with marble and mosaic. The estimates for the Basilica, run to a million pounds, a sum which only America can contemplate with calm assurance. The Church there has never lacked munificent benefactors.

One would have liked to have seen Annapolis, about 20 miles to the east of Washington, for it is the capital of Maryland and the site of the U.S. Naval Academy (which last month I erroneously located at West Point), but my time was up, and about seven in the evening I bade farewell to Washington with grateful memories of much kindness, and resumed my journey to Chicago, my immediate objective being Buffalo and the Falls of Niagara. On arriving about 8.30 on June 16th I made for Canisius College, S.J., a large and well-appointed school in the Buffalo suburbs, which, like all the other Jesuit establishments I encountered, is still growing. A convenient trolley-car to Niagara ran past the door, and I was soon on board for that famous spot. Some verses which I read in a paper as a schoolboy, purporting to have been written by Oscar Wilde on *his* first visit to Niagara, came back to my mind, for that visitor had been only moderately impressed by what he saw, and I wondered whether I should share the common experience of being disappointed at seeing what one had been trying to imagine all one's life. Wilde's modified encomium was versified somewhat as follows:

Falls of Niagara, what shall I say to you?  
 What sort of view of your merits convey to you?  
 You who have so many visitors awed,  
 (Merely inferior persons, no doubt of it)  
 Shall I pronounce you successful or out of it?  
 Are you consummate or are you a fraud?

Much though I fear that my hosts will be hurt if I  
 Cannot consent to your merits to certify,  
 Truth which is quite too supremely divine  
 May not be blinked without blameful impiety,—  
 Where then, Niagara, where's your variety?  
 Where, my poor falls, is your grandeur of line?

Must I confess that you scarcely have got any?  
 Must I remark on your painful monotony?  
 Must I—since thus you continue to thrust  
 Water in floods on one's senses incessantly—  
 Animadvert on *that* feature unpleasantly?  
 Worthy cascade, I'm afraid that I must.

However, after many more verses of æsthetic criticism,  
 clothed in very "precious" language, the poet admits  
 Niagara's good points, and concludes—

Courage, Americans, closed is the ordeal  
 Judged is the cause, and with sympathy cordial  
 Here I announce my decision to you;  
 Justly yet kindly can I in this matter act,  
 Lo! I approve of you, fortunate cataract!  
 Falls of Niagara, pass: you will do!

In spite of a slight disappointment at first, I am able to endorse Wilde's suppositious verdict. I too approve of Niagara. Yet, approaching from the American side, with only the distant Canadian (horse-shoe) Fall in sight, the height (over 150 feet) does not impress one, and the immense pool into which the water plunges seemed from above quite calm and slow-moving. The few hours at my disposal could only be economically expended by taking the circular tour which goes first to the Canadian Fall and then skirts the gorge on that side on the cliff top, returning at the river level on the American side. The cataract became really impressive when, clad in overalls, one got down into the tunnel behind it, and saw tons on tons of water roaring to the base. The trolly-cars run every half-hour, allowing for pauses at the chief places of interest. The rapids about three miles down the gorge are formed by the sudden narrowing of the channel, which causes the water to rise some thirty feet and to rush along at about twenty-seven miles an hour. I went down to the level about the spot where poor Webb was drowned in 1883, and wondered



at the rashness of a man who could attempt to cross these leaping mountains of water. To me the gorge and the whirlpool where, about seven miles down, the river makes a right-angle turn, seemed even grander than the Falls. The Ontario Government has made a small national park on the summit lower down than the whirlpool, and further on rises the Brock Monument, from the base of which can be seen the river broadening into Lake Ontario. A suspension bridge takes you back at this point into America at Lewiston, and the return journey by the water's edge gives an even more vivid impression of the rapids. Since recent times these are lit at night by coloured electric flares, but I could not wait for this scenic effect. Niagara on the whole "does," without it. From Buffalo to Detroit through Canada along the north shores of the Lake Erie took about five hours, and I finished the day at the University of Detroit, founded by the Society in 1877.

Detroit was to be the scene for the next three days, June 17—19, of the Annual Convention of the Catholic Press Association, one of those innumerable gatherings whereby American Catholics labour so successfully to counteract the vastness of their country. The programme promised to be of much interest to one who has control of a struggling periodical, and so it proved, although I could not attend all the sessions. That which interested me most was a very outspoken paper by the Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., Editor of *The Catholic World*, which had for title the pertinent enquiry—"Are there too many Catholic Magazines?" From Fr. Gillis's investigations it appeared that in the States there are upwards of 150 Catholic monthlies alone, few of which can hope to survive on their own merits, a fact which leads to the employment of competitive agents and agencies, not all of whom are above reproach. The revelation was depressing to one who had hoped to do something towards increasing the number of Catholic monthlies in the States. I was struck by the frankness with which this and other subjects were discussed, and by the readiness shown by the various speakers in pooling their special experiences. The debate next day on the News Service of the N.C.W.C., whose *modus operandi* I had witnessed in Washington, showed how literally the Catholic motto, "In essentialibus unitas, in dubiis libertas," was interpreted by the Convention.

Off-hours were devoted to seeing something of Detroit



by night. Like all American cities it blazes with electricity: perhaps the cheap power from Niagara accounts for lavishness: and, seen from the ferry crossing over to Windsor on the Canadian side, it looked very picturesque. Mr. Ford will not take it amiss that I left Detroit without seeing a car made, for it was from no want of appreciation of the utility of his production. It is a question, however, whether this cheap and rapid transit is on the whole a benefit to the race: a question which can only be solved by one who knows what is done with the time thus saved. On Friday, June 18th, I made another excursion into Canada, having to visit a friend at Sarnia, on Lake Huron, close to the north end of the Detroit river, a fine water-way between the lakes crowded with the great stern-engined freighters characteristic of the lake-traffic and bordered for miles by villas and gardens. I spent the night in a bungalow close to the sandy beach, and woke to the sight of huge billows raised by a north wind. It was hard to imagine that the lake is often ice-bound in winter and the Detroit river choked with floes in spring. On Saturday, the eve of the Congress, I returned to Detroit on my way to Chicago. I was very sorry not to be able to see more of the University where I was so hospitably entertained, and of the city itself, which is one of the most remarkable of American municipalities, second only to Chicago in extent and rapidity of growth. Its growth has resulted in one curious feature, viz., the inclusion within the city boundaries of two villages or towns, each numbering about 50,000, which have stubbornly retained their separate municipal administration. Detroit is almost as "foreign" a city as Chicago, about 70 % of the population being of alien birth or parentage.

Chicago was reached on Saturday night, June 19th, after a seven hours' journey. As Loyola University on the north city limits was full up, the Rector thoughtfully billeted five of us, including two Jesuit Bishops, *rare aves in terris*, with an hospitable friend who vacated her entire flat in our favour and took upon herself our care and maintenance. This proved a great convenience on more than one count, for our dwelling in the neighbourhood of Lincoln Park was many miles nearer the Congress centres of activity than was the University, finely situated though the latter is on the very shores of the Lake. Enough, perhaps, has been said in a previous paper about the Congress—a prolonged Act of Faith

uttered with immense emphasis in the midst of a modern community in the very forefront of material civilization. For the visitor the Congress eclipsed the city. He saw in those crowded days only the routes to and from the various places of gathering, and therefore missed much which illustrates very vividly American enterprise and fertility of resource. For instance, originally the sewage from the great city, including the refuse from the stock-yards in its midst, was dumped into Lake Michigan: on the other hand the city's water supply had to be drawn from the same source through several tunnels driven out for several miles under the lake-bed. Subsequently it was found that the area of contamination was approaching the intakes, and so the idea was conceived of draining off the city's refuse inland. For this, an enormous sanitary canal, 28 miles long, 22 feet deep, and about 160 feet wide, was cut through a low watershed, joining the Chicago river with a tributary of the Illinois, which itself joins the Mississippi above St. Louis; a canal which, of course, is meant for navigation as well. And so the Chicago river which flushes the canal now finds an ultimate outlet in the Gulf of Mexico instead of in Lake Michigan! It might be thought that St. Louis would have objected to having the sewage of Chicago thus apparently brought to its doors: however, such are the self-purifying properties of rivers that the Illinois is cleaner at their junction than the Mississippi itself. It seems that another less beneficial effect of the Chicago enterprise has been the gradual lowering of the level of the Great Lakes, with a consequent injury to many harbours along their borders, and a depletion of Niagara!

Mention has been made of the stock-yards, that great business which is at once a main support of Chicago's prosperity and a grievous drawback to the city's amenities. Their output is reckoned at £100,000,000 annually, and they employ directly or indirectly 150,000 workers. On the other hand they occupy 475 acres well up in the S.W. section of the city, and although what is offensive in them can be shut off from sight, it is impossible to shield from them the sense of smell. In themselves they are a masterpiece of efficiency, and the fascinated, if shuddering, onlooker may watch an endless procession of squealing hogs, each hung by a hind leg to a sliding rail which carries them one by one past the butcher's platform where their jugulars are severed, at the maximum

rate of 1,200 an hour. The pig, one knows, squeals on very little provocation; but even if each had the keenest appreciation of the fate that awaited him he could not put more appalling terror into the protest he actually utters. You can witness, too, all that becomes of him after death, but as each carcase spends forty-eight hours in the refrigerator, you cannot, as is commonly supposed, follow any individual from death-bed to ham or sausage, unless indeed you have abundant leisure. Cattle follow much the same programme as the pigs, but each beast is stunned before being killed. The patient sheep go to their doom without a sound. Out of every part of the slain animal something useful and saleable is made, and part of Messrs. Armour's exhibits shows into what an immense variety of marketable objects what used to be regarded as waste can be turned.

During my stay at Chicago I managed to pay a brief visit to Milwaukee, about 90 miles to the north and still on the shores of Michigan, though in the State of Wisconsin. It contains one of the youngest (incorporated 1907) but one of the most progressive of the Jesuit Universities in America, that named Marquette, which is especially strong on its medical side; indeed, its College of Dentistry can have few rivals in the matter of equipment. I was particularly struck by its Law Library and the adjacent reading-room, built to reproduce an ancient English baronial hall. I noticed a young Filipino student acting as Janitor of the main building, and was told that he was thus earning during vacation part of his fees—a common custom in this democratic land. Milwaukee illustrated another American custom familiar to readers of "Babbitt"—the intense local patriotism which issues in "boosting." One met here and there large placards exhorting all and sundry to "boost Milwaukee, the home of industrial harmony." I believe the town has an enviable record for its small number of strikes and lock-outs.

I was at Milwaukee, or *en route*, when the rest of the faithful were paying sacrificial homage to Christ the King at Mundelein, but I had this excuse that I had visited the great Seminary two days before and had been shown over it by Father Furay, S.J., the Prefect of Studies. It is an immense establishment, housing 250 philosophers and theologians with staff, and, in a large separate building which also serves as an infirmary, a community of nuns who look after kitchen and laundry. The whole is in the plain colonial

style of architecture, which in itself is undistinguished but impressive, as here, in the mass. The chapel, the centre of the group of buildings, is, of course, in keeping with them, but hardly in keeping with what a Catholic shrine should be, for the colonial style of church-building<sup>1</sup> seems to have been to erect a steeple on an ordinary oblong, two-storeyed dwelling-house. One felt that Mundelein chapel, though bright and spacious and tastefully decorated within, might have been much more like a Catholic church outside. Vast as the Seminary already is, the Faculty Building is not yet erected, nor the Cardinal's Residence. The various Professors live in the dormitory buildings, where each room is furnished with a sleeping alcove and a separate toilet, containing a shower bath. There is a large gymnasium near the lake and a beautiful covered swimming-pool. I believe there is also a golf-links hidden away in the 1,100 acres of wooded park-land that surrounds the Seminary. The Fathers of the Council of Trent would have marvelled had they foreseen such a grand development of their institution.

One need never lack occasion of meeting Americans in councils or conferences. At least two other important gatherings followed immediately on the great Congress,—the fifth General Convention of the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade at Dayton, Tenn., which began on Friday, June 25, and the twenty-third Annual Convention of the Catholic Educational Association at Louisville, which started on Monday, June 28th. I determined to look in on the latter, as it lay more or less on my way to St. Louis, the Cathedral of which was to be consecrated on the 29th. I had met the Archbishop in Ireland twenty-one years ago, and, on renewing acquaintance at Chicago, he had kindly expressed a hope that I should attend the ceremony. Another motive was that to reach Louisville one had to pass Cincinnati, where dwelt an old friend in Fr. Francis Finn, S. J., one who is a friend also of innumerable boys and girls all over the world, readers of his delightful school-stories. To Cincinnati, therefore, I proceeded on the night of Friday, June 25th, in a cool and comfortable Pullman, which I discovered next morning to have attached a parlour-car and an observation platform: travel-features met by me for the first time.

*(To be continued.)*

J. KEATING.

<sup>1</sup> The unhandsome private chapel near here in S. Audley Street, of which Mundelein is a replica on a larger scale, shows whence the colonial style finally derives.

## RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN PALESTINE

### I.—THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

FOR those who know something of the real history of Europe and have the traditional Christian conscience of the West, there is a minor result of the Great War which appears to them in the forefront as one of the greatest of its achievements. For the first time in six hundred years we can look eastward to the cradle of our religion and see it not obscured by the poisonous half-light of Islam. To the Council of Versailles, to the Press (which manipulates public opinion), to the mass of the people, this may seem a small enough thing. But I venture to say that Godfrey de Bouillon, Richard of England, Raymund de Saint Gilles and their peers, would have accounted the blood and treasure, the misery and terror of five years, only a fitting price to pay for such a privilege: and the public opinion of Europe in that day would have been behind them. Not that I would suggest for a moment that there is much in common between the rescue of Jerusalem, in 1099, and its capture, in 1917, or even that, except in loose rhetoric, the victors of the latter year were engaged in a crusade at all. A crusader was one who fought to deliver the Holy Places from the Moslems, and the Egyptian Expeditionary Force bore about the same relation to the armies of the Crusades as the English "Order of St. John of Jerusalem" does to the Sovereign and Sacred Military Order of that name. Had our politicians had but a little greater degree of success, the hereditary enemies of Christendom would have been our allies and the Holy Land still a Turkish province. Militarily and politically the release of Palestine was an incident in, not the object of, a campaign, so that at best the E.E.F. was descended collaterally and not lineally from the forces of Cœur-de-Lion.

And whereas the army of Duke Godfrey was a cosmopolitan mob, with a common religion and a common enthusiasm, that of General Allenby was a highly trained force, also cosmopolitan, but divided among three religions with any number of subdivisions. The Crusaders took the city; straightway the

Christian banners, the Cross of St. George, the Leopards of England, the Lilies of France, flew over its walls; and there was a terrible massacre of Infidels. When the Allies took the city no conquering flag was hoisted: only the Red Cross (not of St. George, but of Geneva), the Red Crescent and the Red Shield of David were displayed above their respective hospitals. Prudence dictated the course. And again there was a massacre, but of something more noble than Turks: it was a massacre of the high hopes of enthusiastic people. And the root of the trouble was that Jerusalem had been captured, not only by the King of Christian England, but also by the Emperor of India and by the Sovereign of Mr. Balfour. Now, there are some sixty million Mohammedans in India,<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Balfour, in the name of his sovereign, had made a certain promise to the Jews. So it came about that, under the eyes of a horde of oriental mongrels, to whom humility in a leader means weakness, the British conquerors, who do not understand what humility is, adopted, at any rate officially, a humble "we want to please you all" attitude, and succeeded in disappointing everybody more or less. Hence the massacre of hopes.

Jerusalem is the Holy City, not only of Christians, but also of the Jews, and, with much less reason of the Mohammedans; and they rejoiced together when, on 11th December, 1917, General Allenby entered the city by the Jaffa Gate<sup>2</sup> on foot and walking alone, the successor of Cyrus, of Judas Maccabeus, of Constantine, of Heraclius, "visiblement pénétré," said Mgr. Baudrillart, preaching at Saint-Julien-le-Pauvre, in Paris, "du souvenir de Godefroy de Bouillon." It was, indeed, a fine act, conceived in the spirit of the place, thus to enter, dismounted, unarmed, attended only by a few representatives of the Allied forces. But there were some among the Christians, intransigent, as one must be in this land of long memories, who had hoped to see opening and entrance made through the Golden Gate—that portal on whose site was the gate which witnessed the first Palm Sunday procession and, six hundred years later, the return of Heraclius triumphantly bearing the True Cross recovered from the Persians; and for centuries has been blocked up and guarded by Turkish soldiers day and

<sup>1</sup> Sir Francis Younghusband has told the Royal Colonial Institute that "Social relations based on religion must be the true tie between England and India." He should study Fr. Ronald Knox's *Reunion all Round* for some practical suggestions on those lines.

<sup>2</sup> *Bab el Khalil*, the Gate of the Friend, because from it runs the road to Hebron, the home of Abraham, the friend of God.



night, for prophecy had said that through it should come the destroyer of the power of Islam in Jerusalem.

Months passed, and the high hopes were still unfulfilled. Hattin was avenged at Esdraelon and half-a-dozen other battles; Damascus, Tripoli, Aleppo fell: the Turks were literally smashed, and sued for an armistice. But Jerusalem remained *in statu quo*. She became neither the King's Daughter of the Christians nor the Zion of the Jews, but was just *el Kuds*, no less and no more a Mohammedan city than in the days of the Turkish moutesarrif, who held his office from the Sublime Porte. To Catholics the British Administration appeared simply Roman, in that it confined its activities to keeping the peace, settling disputes by compromise and improving the temporal state of the city by the provision of water, and so on. True, a Turkish soldier no longer lounged on the divan within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre itself, defiling the place with the smoke of his cigarette,<sup>1</sup> and one could openly pray in the Cenacle without fear of one's life. But the high-handedness of the Orthodox Greeks was unchecked; the Basilica of the Nativity was not restored; the stolen Tomb of Our Lady was yet in the hands of schismatics. The native Mohammedan had welcomed the British general with a pun, as *el Nebi*, the prophet who had delivered them from the Ottoman tyranny, which had begun just four hundred years before, when Selim I. took Cairo and wrested the Caliphate from the last of the Abbasides; but they soon began to realize that, after all, Brigadier-General Ronald Storrs was, in fact, an accomplished oriental scholar and courteous governor, but Nazrani Hakim Basha and not some Prophet-descended moutesarrif. The Jews, who, when the city fell, had been keeping the Feast of Lights, in commemoration of the deliverance by Judas Maccabeus in 165 B.C., found that the omen was false, that they must still mourn for the Palace which is deserted, the Inheritance defiled by the heathen, for they were yet debarred from the sacred Temple Enclosure, and they themselves regarded with suspicion or contempt by their conquerors. The New Jerusalem was, in fact, still the old Jerusalem: and so it, to a great extent, remains.

When in Palestine in 1917-19, having expected to find that, in popular repute and distinction, the Eastern Orthodox

<sup>1</sup> Though the keys of the Basilica were handed back to the Moslem custodians, representatives of the two families to whom Salah-ed-Din gave charge of the doors in 1187.

Church was to the Catholic Church what the Anglican body is to the Nonconformist in England, I found the exact contrary to be the case.

Of this, one of the keys to the religious position, Mr. Chesterton wrote admirably in *The New Jerusalem* :—

In the East it is Catholicism that stands for much that we associate with Protestantism. It is Catholicism that is by comparison plain and practical and scornful of superstition and concerned for social work. It is Greek Orthodoxy that is stiff with gold and gorgeous with ceremonial, with its hold on ancient history and its inheritance of imperial tradition. In the cant of our own society, we may say it is the Roman who rationalizes and the Greek who Romanizes. It is the Roman Catholic who is impatient with Russian and Greek childishness, and perpetually appealing for common-sense. It is the Greek who defends such childishness as child-like faith and would rebuke such common-sense as common scepticism. I do not speak of the theological tenets or even the deeper emotions involved, but only . . . of contrasts visible even in the street.

The Oriental churches, schismatical or heretical, are indeed stiff with gold and forms, romanizers in the worst sense of that cant term, childish often (but not child-like, only bland), torpid and woefully uncultured. A mere visit to the Latin churches in Jerusalem is a rebuke to one who would doubt our prestige and capability, and it is the same wherever the Church has gained or kept a foothold throughout the land. Schools, medicine and alms-deeds are the three handmaids of religion in Palestine, and French Catholics alone assist in some way or another over 400,000 people annually. Their institutions include thirty-four free dispensaries, seven hospitals, nine orphanages and a home for the aged. But their greatest weapon against infidels, heretics and schismatics is their schools. In 1928 they had one hundred and seven, of which forty-three were directed by French religious and missionaries, and sixty-four by Uniate Catholics of different Eastern rites, with French supervision and help, and their pupils totalled 7,600. The Italians have five schools and a Salesian College at Bethlehem taken over from the French.

But the English and American Protestant Missions that have descended on Palestine, both before and since the war, have two valuable assets. Firstly, they represent the official

religion of the all-conquering British and of what may become here, as in Egypt, not only the protecting nation, but also the governing class. This must give to them a prestige in the eyes of the natives that they have never enjoyed before, for hitherto Protestant missionaries have been looked upon only as an amiable source of temporal advantages, and beneath contempt from any other point of view.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, without wishing to be offensive or using the epithet in any disparaging sense, it must be admitted that the principles of these missionaries are most accommodating. They compass heaven and earth to make a convert, not only from Islam or Judaism, but from the already Christian Catholics, Jacobites, etc., with some or all of whom they claim to be in communion; and lessons learnt in "souperising" days in Ireland have not been forgotten.<sup>2</sup> This is not the place to discuss the worth of such conversions; sufficient to note that their numbers are increasing.

On the other hand, there is a curious feature of Protestant missions in the Near East, of which sight must not be lost. Whenever a mission is established, it is always announced that there is no intention of proselytising among other Christians, but only of offering the advantages of European educational and medical facilities, and cordial co-operation with the native church. And, for a longer or shorter period, this programme is faithfully carried out. But further developments are inevitable. These good men will try to improve, to spiritualize and ultimately to reform these ancient churches (which know more about Christianity than their new teachers have ever heard of): almost invariably they come into collision with the local ecclesiastical authorities, and a few more schisms added to the divisions of Christendom are the result. This is what happened among the Orthodox in 1836, among the Gregorian Armenians, among the Syrian Jacobites, among the Nestorians (whom, for some obscure reason, they call the "Assyrian Church"), and, above all, among the Malabar Christians of South India, where the efforts of the Church Missionary Society have helped to bring about an amazing confusion of sects. The influence of the High Anglicans is not yet strong enough to have had much effect on these proceedings, and we may yet witness the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall gives an illuminating estimate of this native attitude in his *The Valley of the Kings*.

<sup>2</sup> It is a significant fact that twice in the years 1920-1 the Uniate Archbishop of Aleppo (Syrian Rite) had to protest against the unfair bias shown against Catholics in the distribution of charitable funds, subscribed in America by Catholics as well as Protestants.

spectacle of the non-Catholic Christians devouring each other in Palestine, as they have done elsewhere.

These few comments on our separated brethren of Palestine are not set down in any spirit of malice or bitterness, but to show that the Catholic Church does not, as has been sometimes suggested, labour under any tremendously grave disabilities or unusual handicaps in that country. Exercising her customary vigilance, energy and justice, under holy and enlightened leaders, the Latin Church with the co-operation of the Uniates can withstand all encroachments and spread her protecting robe over more and more of the inhabitants of her Master's own land.

## II.—THE JEW.

The troubles of France in Syria have rather overshadowed those of Great Britain in Palestine. But the population of that country by Zionist Jews has not ceased to be a source of great difficulty to the mandatory power, a menace to traditional Christians and a furious irritant to the natives, both Christian and Moslem. The colonization goes on steadily; the infamous Rutenberg concessionaires pursue their plans; but adverse criticism is not dead, and at any moment a violent collision may occur between the colonists and the native party, which has been so ably represented by the Palestine National League in the U.S.A. and by Shibly Jamal Effendi in England.

The Zionist colonization goes on, but a Zionist state is not yet a *fait accompli*. Earl Balfour's famous declaration, promising the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, was received with enthusiasm by most Zionists; but they put no clear or definite questions as to what exactly was meant by the declaration, and it is still possible that, under great pressure from a large section of the Jews themselves and of some (but not all) of the anti-Semite Gentiles, the whole thing may in the long run fizzle out. The problem is complicated, not only by the divergent opinions of the Jews, but also by the very strong feelings of Gentiles on the matter. Distrust and dislike of the Jew are universal, and so is misunderstanding, and it is in regard to this misunderstanding that Mr. Chesterton made a really illuminating contention in *The New Jerusalem*, which seems to drive to the root of the trouble. "Jews" he says, "should

be represented by Jews, should live in a society of Jews, should be judged by Jews and ruled by Jews." Because "Jews are Jews; and as a logical consequence, they are not Russians or Roumanians or Italians or Frenchmen or Englishmen."

If this simple proposition should be universally accepted, it would do away with a deal of the muddle-headed nonsense talked about them. Many people would pack them off to Palestine because, following Goldwin Smith, they contend that they are incapable of patriotism. A good example of this sort of thing appeared in the *Times Literary Supplement*, which, in reviewing the late Israel Zangwill's *The Voice of Jerusalem* (a book which contains ample matter to promote anti-Zionism), arraigned the author as unpatriotic because of some scathing (and probably unjust) criticism of President Wilson. This is stark nonsense. Why should allegiance to England and her Allies, any more than to Russia or Liberia, be expected of Zangwill? Patriotism is due to one's *patria*, and Zangwill, as a Jew, had not got one: but in passionate devotion to the interests of Judaism (whether that term be interpreted as religious or racial), which has been the dominant characteristic of his race throughout the ages, he was not wanting. What more, then, could in justice be asked of him? Those excitable people to whom I referred may be right enough in wanting to give the Jews a country; but, as so often with us English, their reasons are all wrong. The Jew is dangerous, not because he is unpatriotic, but because he is far too patriotic—that is to say, concerned on behalf of his own people.

And it is abundantly clear that if the idea of a Jew being a Jew, and not a Scot or a Pole, receives general acceptance (and perhaps most people already accept it in fact, though not in theory), it becomes necessary for the safety of states and nations that they should have a national home, to which they would be given every facility and encouragement to emigrate. So we should be still faced with the problem of Zionism, but in a simplified form. The question would be no longer "Shall the Jews have a home in Palestine?" but "Shall the Jewish home be in Palestine or elsewhere?" To this hypothetical question I unhesitatingly answer, "Elsewhere," and put forward four, from among many, reasons which I submit are equally cogent when applied to the problem as it stands to-day.

The first may be termed a reason of religion, of sentiment or of prejudice, according to the disposition of the reader,

and is this—that it seems an intolerable lapse from *pietas* that the Jews, of all people, should be encouraged to overrun the country which to Christians is holy beyond words. From being the Chosen People, they became the accursed people; they were popularly regarded as such throughout the Middle Ages, and are so looked upon by many even to our own day. And not without reason. The Messiah, for Whose coming they had looked so long, was rejected and driven to a shameful death, and His Blood is still upon their heads. The efficacy of that Blood to redeem them is still denied, and neither the Jews as a people, nor their religious leaders, have ever made manifestation of any repentance for their crime. “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” But it should not be necessary to point out that forgiveness does not necessarily carry with itself the remission of punishment. And if there is one thing that seems to stand out in history as part of the punishment of this race, it is their exile from the Promised Land.

Many eminent Jews oppose Zionism, because they see no indication of God’s providence that their people should re-establish Zion at this time. Christians, from their own angle, may hold a similar view. An invitation to return, that is part of a political programme, with the implicit obligation of keeping an eye on allied interests in the Levant, is a sign from God that should satisfy neither them nor us.

Allied to this objection is that of the sort of Jew who is doing the colonization. Traditional Judaism is “unfulfilled Catholicism”: we Catholics are “developed Jews” and owe a particular regard to our brethren. But the Zionists are not traditional Jews; they are the froth of that disruption of intellect and intelligence that boils in Europe to-day; they are not the children of the patriarchs, but of Haeckel, of Marx, of Lenin. A Zionist, Myriam Harry, herself draws up the indictment: she makes it clear enough what Zionism is and what it is not, both by her own words:—

I became acquainted with Zionists. They were priests neither of Jehovah nor of Baal. With religion they had little concern, with agriculture, industry, hygiene, very much; . . . . American bankers, Dutch engineers, Belgian agricultural experts, German commercial travellers in machinery: speculating on the new Palestine, on the recuperated Promised Land;

and by the words of Zionists to her:



. . . . the Zionists are not religious, or, rather, not ritualists. In our colonies you will see neither synagogue nor rabbi . . . it isn't a religious question ; it is a matter of sentiment. We have no concern in political or religious matters. We have but one God—Labour : but one cult—our nationality : but one prayer—the work of our hands, that will help us to rebuild Erez-Israel. We thought it more useful to build hospitals and schools [than synagogues]. Religion is a matter of conscience. Each man can pray in his own home. We Jews don't need a rabbi, who is only a Doctor of Divinity.

If this movement solidifies into a Zionist state, it appears that the land of Jehovah and Jesus will present an organized synthesis of modernist heresies : materialism, nationalism, financierism, communism, sicklied over with humanitarianism and sentimentalism and bolstered up by every mechanical and intellectual fad of the twentieth century.

Alas ! for

. . . . those holy fields  
Over whose acres walked those blessed feet  
Which fourteen hundred years ago were nail'd  
For our advantage to the bitter cross.

The third objection to Palestine as a home for the Jews is purely practical, and may be stated very shortly. Under the best conditions it is improbable that the country could support more than one million souls. Its pre-war population was already about 700,000, and it is incredible that less than one-fortieth of the Jews in the world should want to take advantage of the offered home. Moreover, it is already twice as densely populated as the U.S.A., and since the States have deemed it necessary to limit immigration, it would seem that Palestine is still less able to support an influx.

This difficulty might not arise if effect should be given to the moderate ideas of such as Dr. Weizmann, which were very clearly expressed by Mr. Albert Hyamson in his *Palestine : the Rebirth of an Ancient People*, where he wrote, " The possibility of an Independent Jewish State cannot be discussed in the course of the present generation or at any date which either the writer or the reader can expect to see. Local autonomy is all that the Jews of Palestine ask—the development of the system which has already been inaugurated and whose success has been proved by experience. The Jews desire no favour, as

compared with other inhabitants of the land. They are willing for all the advantages of a free and liberal government to be enjoyed by all equally. Thus, if Palestine ultimately becomes entirely—that is to say, overwhelmingly Jewish—it will become so, not by artificial means, but as a consequence of natural growth."

This is all very well, but the voice of extreme Zionism sounds very differently. Zangwill made his programme quite plain. "The [Palestinian] Arabs should recognize that the road of their renewed national glory lies through Baghdad, Damascus and Mecca, and all the vast territory freed for them from the Turks, and be content, so far as Palestine is concerned, to be politically submerged." They would withdraw under the "impending pressure" of the "small but expansible Jewish force" which would be "backed up by Britain or the Allies, exactly as Poland or Czecho-Slovakia has been backed up." And this peaceful and equitable scheme brings me most conveniently to the fourth objection to a Jewish Palestine.

With the possible exception of the Armenians, there are no people more loathed and feared by the native population<sup>1</sup> of Palestine than the Jews, and the menace of the Jewish invasion has made a significant alliance between Christian and Moslem. "The Syrians and Arabs and all the agricultural and pastoral populations of Palestine are, rightly or wrongly, alarmed and angered at the advent of the Jews to power, for the perfectly practical and simple reason of the reputation which the Jews have all over the world." They see themselves being driven off their land, bought up by capitalist colonists, reduced to the status of wage-earners under the Jews.<sup>2</sup> It does not matter to them whether it is by "development of the system which has been already inaugurated" or by Zangwill's camouflaged form of forcible suppression: the result is much the same.

Dr. Weizmann has said, "The Arabs need us, with our knowledge and our experience and our money. If they do not

<sup>1</sup> Usually referred to, somewhat loosely (or by a deliberate obscurantism of Zionists) as Arabs. They in fact consist chiefly of very mongrel "settled" Arabs, nomadic Bedu Arabs and Arabic-speaking Syrians. These last are descendants of the non-Jewish inhabitants of the land in the time of our Lord, and many are Christians of one sort or another; their Aramaic speech was superseded about the seventh century at the time of the Arab invasion.

<sup>2</sup> It is admitted that much of the work of such successful Jewish colonies as Rishon-le-Zion and Zimmurin has always been done by Syrian labour.

have us they will fall into the hands of others, and will fall among sharks." Their knowledge, their experience, their money! The very things that have excited the fear and hatred of Arabs and Syrians: that have excited the fear and hatred of simple-minded and clear thinking men throughout Europe and America, till there has appeared in our day a spectre, more menacing and less spectral than the "Yellow Peril," the spectre of the Conquering Jew.

I have shown in the first section some of the precautions that were taken at the capture of Jerusalem to avoid hurting the feelings of native Christians, Mohammedans or Jews. Had circumstances made it impossible to avoid offending someone, there is no doubt that the Christians would have been selected to suffer—which would have been a compliment, though not intended as such. Now, to please a party among the Jews for political reasons, Great Britain inflicts a gross wrong upon both the Christians and the Moslems of the Holy Land. Writing in the *Dublin Review*, six months after the capture of the city, Mgr. Canon William Barry said, "Now Jerusalem is quit of the Turk, it must not be made the chessboard of national rivalries or of strife among the adherents of creeds too long set in array, too little studied for points of reconciliation. Let the 'abode of peace' justify its name." One cannot but assent whole-heartedly, but with this proviso: that it is not a peace dishonouring to Christendom.

DONALD ATTWATER.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### SIR PHILIP SIDNEY IN IRELAND.

ALTHOUGH it is known that Sir Philip Sidney paid a visit to Ireland, and wrote sympathetically of Irish bards, few suspected that he made a stay of over two-and-a-half years in Erin. Yet, it is now beyond question, he actually resided in Ireland, both as a boy and, subsequently, as a young man after his return from France. His father, Sir Henry Sidney, held responsible posts in Ireland for almost twenty years, having been Vice-Treasurer and Treasurer for War from 1556 to 1559; Lord Deputy from May, 1565, to April, 1571, and again from September, 1575, to March, 1578. From the *Calendar of State Papers (Ireland)* we gather some interesting sidelights as to young Philip, who was beloved by Cecil "as he were mine own," and who is described by Sir Edward Denny, in a letter of October 6th, 1581, as "the most worthy young man in the world." While in Ireland a marriage had been arranged between Philip and Cecil's daughter Anne; but the arrangement came to nought, and eventually the poet-hero of Zutphen married Frances, daughter of Sir Francis Walsingham.

The recent publication of the *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de l'Isle and Dudley present at Penshurst Place* (Vol. I, Hist. MSS. Com.), admirably prepared and edited by Mr. C. L. Kingsford, F.B.A., gives us some welcome details as to the Sidney household in Ireland, and we can visualize the surroundings of the young Philip, his musical tastes, his schoolmaster Ludovick Briskett, his games at tennis, his dramatic entertainments, his love for hunting, etc. Sir Henry Sidney's "Irish Accounts" from 1556 to 1578 is of outstanding importance. The original document was burned in the Four Courts, Dublin, a few years ago; but, fortunately, a duplicate copy has been preserved among the muniments at Penshurst Place, and this copy can now be studied at ease by readers of the Report, even though the private entries are mixed up with the official accounts.

Glancing through these Irish accounts (covering eighty pages of print) we meet with many interesting items, e.g., "£10, in part payment of £40" to Humphrey Powell "for the imprinting of the Statutes of the Realm and other works, by warrant of 21st December, 1556"; Goshawks and tercelles given to the Marquis de Sara; £5 10s. to three Irish Pipers, Sheridan, O'Donoghue and Shane duff; a pair of Virginals, £3, mending and tuning, £1; making of a Lute and mending another, 13s.; eleven Visors, £2 15s., and trimming of masking apparel, 9s.; for a chalice by

the soldiers stolen from the Friars of Galway, £3 6s. 8d.; for chapel on the bridge of Dublin converted into a bakehouse, £6 18s. 1½d.; Sir Peter Lewes for the Bridge of Athlone, £1011 6s.; repairs to Dublin Castle, £1352 8s.; towards the printing of an English Bible for the state of this realm, £66 13s. 4d.; a Bible for the church at Carrickfergus, 22s.; offering at Christ Church, 6s.; to Ludovick Briskett, in full payment of annuity of £5 per annum, during the time he remained in Italy, 22nd November, 1569, £3; singing men of Christ Church, 23s. 4d.; the Lord of Misrule at Drogheda, 10s.; the charge of the great tombstone sent into England; paid to masons and workmen to square and hew the said stone, £5 8s. 0½d.; the restoration of Strongbow's tomb, £4.

But, of course, our main interest is in the items relative to Sir Philip. We learn that he accompanied his father on many of his "journeys" through all parts of Ireland. On one of these trips in co. Wexford, he got a present of two fine Wexford horses. The official record is: "Given away by my Lord, exchanged and sold to his lordship's use (including 'Pied Peppard,' sent into England with Mr. Philip Sidney, and 'Grey Synnott' given to Mr. Philip Sidney)." From other sources we learn that Anthony Peppard, of Glascarig, and Sir Richard Synnott, of Ballybrennan, were two magnates of co. Wexford at this period, and, doubtless to ingratiate themselves with the Lord Deputy, they had made him presents of two horses, which were accordingly named "Pied Peppard" and "Grey Synnott."

Master Philip kept an Irish "boy" (in Ireland the word "boy" applies to all ages) named Dermot, who also acted as a sort of intelligence officer, that is, presuming "Derby the Irisshe boy" to be the same as "Derbie the spy," who was given £5 "in reward for spial money and intelligence." In 1566 "Mr. Philip" lost 3s. 4d. "at the Tenys," and in 1570 he bought a velvet cap at a cost of 79s. We also meet with a payment of £10 16s. for his charges in riding to Oxford, also in 1575 he was given £60 as a present from his father, also £139 "of eight several times," and £2 10s. 5d. for his charge at Cashel, co. Tipperary.

The identifications of Irish place-names must have cost no small trouble to Mr. Kingsford, but, on the whole, he has been wonderfully successful. However, as a contribution towards Corrigenda, in Vol. II the following slips may be noted: "Bredach, or Bradaugh, co. Donegal," is really Corrigbroad, co. Lough; "Darbor, co. Westmeath," is Darver, co. Louth; "Fernecrew, co. Antrim," is in co. Derry; "Kilkerry, co. Wexford," is Kilkerry, co. Westmeath; "Trim," is not in Leix, but in co. Meath; "Marlinstown, co. Westmeath," is "Mornington," near Drogheda; "Meelick, co. Mayo," is in co. Galway; "Minister Overous," is Monasteroris, Edenderry (Offaly), not "Monasterevan"; "Ashton (?) Wexford," is Athboy, co. Meath.

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

## THREE FORGOTTEN MARTYRS.

IN the year 1612, Chile—we read in an old eighteenth century “*Historia de los Jesuitas en Chili*”—that colony of Spain which stretched in theory between a desert, a chain of great mountains and an ocean, had in fact the River Biobio, flowing from the Andes to the Pacific, for its southern boundary. For while the central part of the country was effectively administered as a colony, all the southern district was in a state of revolt which more than a decade of fatiguing, expensive warfare had failed to subdue. The Indians of South Chile were a brave and capable people, impassioned lovers of freedom, who had repelled the colonial forces again and again.

Within the colony, meanwhile, there was a force which was determined to change the attitude of the government to the southern Indians. Father Luis de Valdivia, of the Society of Jesus, had come to Chile less than twenty years earlier with seven other Jesuits, and he and they had a great love for the native people. Watching their treatment by the colonial authorities and the colonists, learning the history of their relations with the Spaniards, Father Luis was convinced that the war against them was unrighteous, and he became the advocate of a new policy. The Spaniards were to defend the territory north of the Biobio, which they had really settled, and where the native population obeyed them, but the Indians who stayed on the south side of that river were to be left unmolested and masters of their country so long as they formally acknowledged, or did not formally repudiate, the supremacy of the Spanish crown. South of the Biobio no weapon was to be used against them save persuasion and enlightenment. They were to be evangelized while their rights were respected, and thus the Church would be freed from the fatal association with violence and oppression which stood in the way of her progress in Chile.

De Valdivia was unable, as was to be expected, to impose his view on the colonial government, but he made the long voyage to Madrid and induced Philip III. to issue, in 1612, a decree that the war in Chile should henceforth be defensive only, and that the colonial administration should not extend to the southern part of the country, where no European subjects should have rights of travel except the Jesuits, whose functions were to be those of peaceful missionaries. Armed with this decree, and holding the offices of governor of the southern diocese of Chile and royal visitor of all the Indians in the country, as well as that of vice-provincial of the Chilean Mission, the Father came back to the colony. His policy could no longer be resisted, and peace fell suddenly on South Chile.

Some dozen years earlier the colony had had a real, if precarious, hold on the south, which had at that time included Spanish



settlements. Then the whole southern people had risen in rebellion, and the Spaniards had been massacred or driven out, while a considerable number, especially of Spanish women and children, had been taken captive by the rebels. There had indeed been Spanish captives among the Indians almost from the time of the first conquest of Chile, but never so many as during and after the fighting of the early seventeenth century. It was almost certainly then that a leading southern chief named Ancanamon obtained possession of a Spanish woman whom he made his principal wife. She had children by him and he was evidently fond of her, allotting her the chief one of the three hearths in his "large and capacious" hut, the hearth by which he himself and his honoured guests were wont to take their food, receiving it from her as she cooked it. But he did not win her from attachment to her own people, for when all at once peace came upon the land, and she knew that the ways were no longer infested by Spanish soldiers and Indian braves, she fled to the Spanish fort of Paicavi. She took with her not only her own two half-bred children, but also two of Ancanamon's grown-up daughters and two other Indian women of his household. Moreover, the refugees desired more than an asylum. The Spanish woman had taught her faith to the others—Indian women have time to talk and also to think, as they weave with their big wooden looms—and all but one of them asked for baptism.

It was a critical moment. Ancanamon had hitherto inclined to friendliness; he was attracted by Spanish civilization, as his preference for his Spanish wife and his kindness to some other captives had shown. Undoubtedly he could be a valuable friend, undoubtedly he would be infuriated when he found himself without a family, and undoubtedly the prudent course was to send his women and children back to him. But Father de Valdivia, who was consulted, set the supernatural above the natural: there was no likelihood of the Christians being allowed to practise their faith amongst the natives, so the women and children were baptized and kept in safety.

The policy of establishing missions in the southern interior was about to be inaugurated, and two Jesuit priests with a lay brother were ready to cross the frontier between the centre and the south. One of the priests was an Italian, Father Horazio Vecchi or Vecchi, a "noble patrician of Siena in Tuscany." The other, Father Martin de Aranda, was a Spaniard born in Chile, in the southern town of Villa Rica, since abandoned to the Indians. He was the son of a Conquistador and had "inherited with nobility an inclination to arms." He had indeed been bred to arms and had commanded, with distinction, a troop of horse in the colonial army which fought against the Indians. His horsemanship was unusually dexterous, even in Spanish America. When he first had a vocation to religion he wished to be a lay coadjutor to the

Jesuits, and it was only in deference to their wishes that he took priest's orders. It was probably humility which held him back. Probably also, it was on account of the knowledge of the Indian language and customs, which he must have acquired in his boyhood, that he was chosen for this mission. The lay-brother who accompanied the priests was likewise a colonial, Brother Diego Montalvan, born in Mexico. He too had begun life as a soldier and had fought against the Indians in Chile. He had been admitted to the Company by Father Luis de Valdivia himself.

These Jesuits were in a garrisoned place on the frontier when the news came that Ancanamon was on the warpath. Possibly because this chief had previously been friendly, they were bound for the district where his power lay. They do not seem to have thought, even for an instant, of turning back or waiting, although they and everyone else in that place knew into what danger they were running. The soldiers gathered to see them start, and parted "amid tears and acclamations" from three men prepared for death.

A few days later they were about to celebrate Mass before a handful of people, who perhaps were spies or may have been Indians more or less mindful of the teaching of earlier missionaries. We picture the two priests, the server, and that group of wild men and women, collected in the pure morning, perhaps in a half-ruined chapel which was a vestige of the Spanish occupation, perhaps before a rough altar in the open air. The rite had not yet begun when the hideous noise of an Indian onslaught broke the holy stillness. Ancanamon was on them with two hundred of his men. It is easy to imagine the confusion, the panic of the little congregation, fleeing where they could and ready to deny any motive but curiosity or treachery which may have brought them to that spot. The Jesuits, in the midst of an infuriated, savage mob, were as much at the mercy of bloodthirsty instincts as any of the Christians who were thrown to the lions in the Colosseum. They were there and then butchered. So died these martyrs, Horazio, Martin and Diego, well prepared for death.

Ancanamon's sin was not visited on his people. It did not turn from his path Father Luis de Valdivia, who pursued his plan of peaceful evangelization unflinchingly, and it was not until after the death of Philip III., whom this great Jesuit had persuaded to his own mind in the matter, that the offensive war against the Indians of the south was resumed in Chile. Even while it was waging, and after it until the expulsion of the Company from the colony in 1767, the Jesuits continued to work in South Chile as unarmed missionaries. But they ceased to incur martyrdom there, because the Indians had learnt to distinguish between them and the mere military adventurers, and to recognize them as friends.

H. D. IRVINE.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**The Cult  
of  
St. Francis.**

October is the culminating month in this Franciscan year, for the Saint died seven centuries ago on October 3rd. Apart from the Apostles, no other Saint in the Calendar has so impressed the non-Catholic imagination, and there are no signs that his universal cultus is diminishing. The Church, of course, is honouring him all over the world, and amongst Catholics he will always remain a perpetual stimulus and inspiration to holiness, since he embodies so completely the Catholic ideal of love and self-sacrifice. We need not take it amiss that the non-Catholic admiration of the Saint is often founded on a misinterpretation of his spirit and an inadequate perception of the real meaning of his message. It is something to have the world admiring one who was so unworldly, and the heretic devoted to so staunch a child of the Church. Their sympathy may gradually produce a fuller appreciation of the faith that was his very life. When the Apostle John told our Lord, with a certain touch of officiousness, how they had stopped some one who was not of their company from casting out devils in His name, Christ rebuked him by pointing out that the worker of such miracles would not readily speak evil of Him by whose power he wrought them. So the cultus of St. Francis, the poet, the humanist, the friend of animals, the lover of simplicity, one-sided, sentimental, and superficial as it often is, at any rate leads its votaries into some contact with and understanding of that great institution of whose essence St. Francis was. They will learn from him that asceticism, so far from being a blind self-tormenting, is the very language of divine love, that love for man and other living things, nay, for inanimate Nature too, is essentially love for God, their author and upholder, that detachment means freedom and joy, just as sin means slavery, and that the institutional Church, with her sacraments and ritual worship, brings the soul closer and more immediately to God than any individual efforts can. Catholics may still have to labour, after the fashion indicated in the little play we printed last month,<sup>1</sup> to clear the Saint's character of misconceptions caused by ill-informed devotion, but Francis with his vivid faith and burning love will continue for all time his gracious mission of mediating to those outside the fold something at least of the Catholic ideal.

**St. Francis  
not a  
"Nationalist."**

He is ill-served, as the Holy Father points out, when his love of country is made the shield of an exaggerated nationalism. Lover of mankind as he was Francis would have been the last man to encourage that parochialism run to seed which looks

<sup>1</sup> Which, we believe, is to be acted in London on Oct. 25th, by the "Little Players of St. Francis."

upon hate and contempt of the foreigner as a mark of good citizenship,—a spirit which, alas! is everywhere alive to-day, nowhere more so than amongst certain sections of St. Francis's own countrymen. Nationalism, "the next heresy to be condemned," is rife in the jingo press of every land. It infects nearly all their history books and their school training. It may be seen, naked and disgraceful, in the Mexican persecution of the "foreign" priesthood. It is the source of the maltreatment of racial minorities all over Europe. It poisons the atmosphere of Geneva, and, one day, unless kept in bounds, it will wreck the League of Nations. It is a spirit which Catholics, by their very profession of a higher allegiance than that called for by civil citizenship, are bound to be on their guard against, lest it blur their outlook on the world and sour their Christian charity. It is a mean device whereby a man tries to evade the reproach of self-conceit by clothing his natural arrogance in the guise of patriotism. The animal-lover, imbued as he thinks with the Franciscan spirit, will be kind to dogs and cats and birds of every country, but will often limit his regard for humans to those of his own race. From the miserable spirit of jingoism, one of the worst effects of the Fall, the mortal foe of Christianity, and chief obstacle to the spread of the Church, may St. Francis deliver us.

**The League  
or  
Armageddon.**

This journal, moved by the deep conviction that the only alternative to an all-inclusive League of Nations is a system of partial alliances, competitive armaments, and a Greater War than ever, has consistently supported the idea of the League, whilst other Catholic periodicals, more critical of its founders, more suspicious of its composition, less free, perhaps, from nationalist prepossessions, have either been content to dwell on its shortcomings or have even prophesied its failure. Hence we are delighted to see our colleagues of the *Civiltà Cattolica* coming out, in their August issue, with a strong plea for support of the League, and pointing out that the conception of a *societas civitatum* has recently been developed and commended by more than one Pope, and that it is thoroughly in harmony with the spirit of Christianity. Frankly we cannot understand how any Catholic, who believes in the origin and destiny of the human race, should be indifferent or hostile to a device intended to make operative the unity of all mankind in the observance of justice and charity. Nor how any sober mind can contemplate without horror and revulsion the only possible alternative to the League—the futile struggle for security by dint of precarious alliances and ever-growing armaments with the inevitable result, sooner or later, of another world-wide war. The idea of the League is the chief piece of salvage from the wreck of civiliza-

tion in 1914-1918, and yet there are multitudes who are seemingly willing to jettison it. But the League cannot function without the religious idea, *i.e.*, without reference to Christian morality. Hence the necessity of the Church Universal coming to its aid, furnishing it with a fixed and lofty ethical standard and inspiring it with that spirit of sacrifice for the common good of humanity which so far has been notably absent from its deliberations. It is becoming more and more noticeable that the advice given to the belligerents in August, 1917, by Benedict XV. embodied the truest wisdom, for, taught by sad experience and after immeasurable harm done, the world is gradually adopting it item by item. Nothing shows more clearly the mental and moral blindness caused by the war mentality that permeated Versailles than the number of stupidities and injustices embodied in that so-called Peace Settlement. Almost the only saving gleam of wisdom discernible in it was the Covenant of the League itself with its far-seeing 19th Article, enabling the Assembly to advise from time to time the reconsideration of treaties which have become inapplicable. It may be that on the strength of this safe-guard the peace-makers let pass many anomalies and arbitrary enactments, trusting for their removal to the future action of the League. They would have been wiser to have adopted Pope Benedict's advice from the first. If only that "entire and reciprocal condonation" of war-damages and war-costs (with special consideration for special claims) had been agreed on, instead of the madly inconsistent policy of first beggaring the vanquished and then expecting them to indemnify the victors to the last penny, what hours of futile wrangling, ending in the victors paying more in the aggregate than the vanquished, would have been spared us. And if that agreement between all the belligerents for a "simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments" to the necessary minimum for internal order, had been come to, we should not now be groaning under the burden of armed forces which if they mean anything mean that the chief nations still expect war. It was, of course, not only the mistaken policy of aiming at security by force that caused this sinister result but mainly the opposition of the Big Armament Businesses to any diminution of profits. And yet over eight years ago at Versailles the Members of the League agreed "that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objection"!

**The Admission  
of  
Germany.**

If Locarno meant the definite abandonment of the old-time division of Europe into allies and enemies, and the tardy birth of an international spirit, the ratification of Locarno by the admission of Germany into the League with a permanent Council-

seat must be welcomed by all lovers of peace, despite the incidental secession of Brazil and Spain. (Both those Powers, by the way, remain members in a sense until the expiry of their two years' notice, and have a right still to send delegates.) Now, as far as Europe is concerned, the League has a chance of developing an international mind. Owing to the increase of members of the Council it has become constitutionally a more unwieldy body than it was, but it is able to reform itself. It must not be forgotten that the Assembly is the Sovereign body in the League, a fact which certain delegates pointed out when the Council presented it on Sept. 6th with several cut-and-dried decisions. Theoretically it might have rejected them, but no one liked to take the responsibility of suggesting that course. It would be impossible, and indeed undesirable, to prevent private discussions and engagements outside the regular meetings of Assembly or Council: much of the most important work of the League may well be accomplished in that way. But nothing should be done to tie the hands of the League's Parliament beforehand. It is all to the good in our opinion that members of the League should make separate treaties of friendship and mutual assistance amongst themselves, like that recently concluded between Spain and Italy, because of two safeguards which membership of the League involves—first, that any point in such treaties which is found incompatible with League obligations becomes *ipso facto* void, and secondly, that no such treaty has any force unless openly registered with the League. The fact that no less than 1,200 treaties have thus been deposited with the Secretariat during the last six years is a sign of the gradual interlocking of interests amongst European nations.

**Probable Effects  
of  
Germany's Entry.**

If it is left to Herr Stresemann and M. Briand, who spoke to such Christian purpose in the Assembly on Sept. 10th, Germany and France have buried the war-hatchet for ever. But both Statesmen have a difficult people to handle and neither can muzzle the irresponsible nationalist press which, because of its wrong principles, or its lack of principle, is the chief menace to peace in the world. However, the admission of Germany has altered the whole complexion of the League. For one thing, it will now become impossible to maintain for long those various inhibitions imposed on Germany by the Versailles Treaty. There would be something altogether incongruous in treating a member of the Assembly and of the Council as in any sense a pariah, an associate not to be trusted, on whose possessions a hold had to be maintained as a guarantee of honesty. The last vestiges of discrimination must now disappear, with the exception of the obligations under the Dawes plan, which,



as we have said, press analogously on the victors as well. The German delegate in his skilful and courteous speech mentioned one explicitly which all will recognize as especially important. "The complete disarmament of Germany was stipulated by the Treaty of Versailles as a preliminary to general disarmament. It is to be hoped that some activity may be shown in advancing this general disarmament, thus proving henceforward that a great positive force abides in the League's ideals." These plain and prudent words show what Germany expects, and has a right to expect,—that, in spite of financial interests and the militaristic element everywhere, war expenditure must be ruthlessly cut down. This is the real test of the League's earnestness.

**Secession  
or  
Reform.**

Both Herr Stresemann and M. Briand expressed regret at the attitude and action of Spain and Brazil; that regret will be universally shared, for both Powers are sacrificing very substantial

advantages on the altar of national prestige, and have given an example which, if it became common, would make the League impossible. Both have shown themselves incapable of taking the larger international view, a view which includes the possibility of the League Council, by vote of the Assembly, becoming more democratic, abolishing the distinction between permanent and non-permanent members, and making membership depend on a free two-thirds majority vote. Article 4, which gave its original form to the Council, is becoming a subject of criticism within the League, and the final form of the Council is as yet by no means settled. To quit the League on a mere question of precedence is to show an inadequate sense of its meaning in the world and of its possibilities. On the other hand to remain within it and blindly pursue merely nationalist interests, as several States are doing in regard to disarmament, is almost as bad. By Article VIII. of the Covenant the various members undertook "to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval, and air programmes, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to war-like purposes." In the Disarmament Commission, the Italian, American, and British officers are opposing any scheme of investigation under League auspices of complaints against a State not observing disarmament conditions—an endeavour to eat one's cake and still have it, which is constantly in evidence in League discussions. All the more necessary is a solid and well-informed public opinion in each country which will insist on Governments going on working until they attain some sort of proportional disarmament however great the difficulties.

**The Coal Dispute  
and Government  
Inaction.**

The coal dispute drags on to the continued discredit of the two parties immediately concerned and of the Government whose far from masterly inactivity has disappointed and disgusted the community. The Coal Report cost the taxpayer £23,000,000; to that extent he became a partner in the coal industry; yet the Coal Report which was the outcome of the best wisdom and experience at our command has been practically set aside, and the opponents, for all the Government has done, are as obdurate in opposition as ever. The whole situation is a disgrace to a Christian people, for it has come about only because Christian public opinion has not been strong enough to prevent it. The public has not insisted on the Government doing what was necessary to make the recommendations of the Report law, as it was in a position to do, even if it had been necessary to resume the control it had exercised during the war. The facts of the situation have all been established by the Commission: a constant reiteration of these facts in clear and brief compass, with the measures necessitated by them, would have prepared the public mind to support those measures. Meanwhile, pending legislation, the miners could have been allowed to resume work on the pre-strike terms, the present economic deficit in working to be supplied by the Government in the form of a loan to be gradually repaid when the industry had regained prosperity. As things are, the owners have lost indefinitely more than uneconomic wages would have cost them, the men of course have lost millions of pounds and done much to cripple the industry, and the Government has allowed a suicidal quarrel to be prolonged by not following up the wise and scientific effort they had made to end it. The belated endeavour now being made to end the disastrous strife might have been made and should have been made three months ago.

**The Paramount  
Claims of the  
Coal Industry.**

The stoppage is so opposed to the immediate interests of both parties that both are credited with ulterior aims which they consider worth the cost. The owners are supposed to desire to destroy the Miners' Federation, which is the only safeguard the worker has against exploitation. The workers, again, are credited with the object of so paralysing the industry that the Government would have to intervene by a policy of nationalization. No one who knows the history of Capitalism would be surprised if the charge against the owners were proved to be true: the very obstinacy of the worker is due to his knowledge that he can expect no mercy from the modern industrial machine. And as for the miners' leaders, their reported utterances, though naturally full of sympathy for their own class, show little

economic wisdom or appreciation of national welfare. Who would expect such men to come together without a lead from Government, or to agree on any course without much Government pressure? The cry of the Capitalist—away with Government interference—need only be heeded when modern industry develops a Christian conscience, and gives the human worker the consideration due to him. Until that time it is the special duty of the State, as Pope Leo has pointed out, to care for and protect the wage-earner as the most helpless member of the community. Moreover, in this matter of coal-mining, it may be urged that the care and protection of the State is the more called for, in that the industry is necessary for so many others: it has a claim, therefore, for exceptional treatment in the matter of wages, and there is no force in the argument, frequently heard, that any other industry may as justly claim a subsidy in its needs. There is no industry, as things are at present, so necessary for our well-being, as this of coal-getting. In keeping it alive we are benefiting the whole community. The public recognized that fact by that gift of twenty-three millions. Would that it were equally keen in demanding from the Government the measures necessary to set it going again. Transport, steel, cotton, shipping—the interests of all these trades and a hundred more depending on peace in the coal trade—yet we have no record that any Employers' Federation or Trade Union has approached the disputants with the demand that they shall come to terms.

**Economic Questions  
essentially  
Ethical.**

Once again we would urge upon Catholics the need of an intelligent interest in these economic problems. They are essentially moral problems as well, as much the concern of the Christian as of the politician. They are aspects of the virtue of distributive justice. The moral principles which regulate and ultimately solve them can and should be learned with the Catechism. No young man or woman leaving school should be ignorant of their bearing, for at any moment by word or act he or she may be called upon to state the Christian point of view. It is especially the concern of the educated to emancipate the Catholic conscience, and to free Catholic practice from the inhuman and therefore unChristian tradition of making human welfare subordinate to money-making, of basing profits on one's neighbour's needs. In spite of all Pope Leo and subsequent Popes have taught, in spite of the exhortations of our higher pastors, many, too many, of the clergy and laity in this country are still ignorant of this aspect of Christianity, and therefore take little share in correcting the abuses of Capitalism. But there will be no peace in the industrial world, any more than in the world at large, till justice and charity rule all the relations of men.

Although the ethics of the Gospel never conflict with reason, there are practices urged there and **Capitalism not intrinsically Wrong.** principles set forth that on the surface seem "hard sayings" and are apt to puzzle and estrange the casual reader. Therefore those who apply Christian ethics to current problems must be careful so to explain their theme that they do not affront common sense and propound something practically unworkable. Especially is this the case in dealing with modern financial questions. Christian ethics are immutable in the sense that no lapse of time or change of circumstances can turn what is evil *in se* into something good or indifferent. To say, as a writer in the *Catholic Times* (Sept. 10, p. 11) does, that "slavery was not in itself repugnant to the Christian conscience in the ages of faith—though it certainly is repugnant in our own times," is to seem to suggest that the modern loss of faith has made conscience more enlightened: though that is far from the writer's purpose. Slavery stands ethically just where it stood in St. Paul's time and in the days of St. Thomas—not an immoral state of life in itself but full of possibilities of hideous wrong, both in its causes and in its circumstances. A man who sells his labour for a time may also sell it for life, but he cannot sell, nor may another buy, more than his services: his essential rights remain inalienably his own. So the State may inflict life-long slavery in punishment for crime, but still must leave the prisoner free in conscience. It was because slavery never *de facto* originated in a free contract that the influence of Christianity was set from the first against it, and finally secured its abolition. Again, to maintain that the Capitalist may not rightly use his money to create more (which in turn may be used in the same way), but can only aim at providing a decent maintenance for himself and his family in keeping with their state of life—another conclusion from the same article—is to forget that the whole structure of Society has changed since St. Antonino and others drew up these rules. Then the caste-system was prevalent: then a trader had to remain a trader and could not hope to raise his social condition: now he may, and often does, become a peer, and reach the highest social dignity and office. Accordingly the "state of life" which was fixed in those days is now capable of indefinite improvement. It is only clouding moral issues to introduce distinctions which no longer have force. No one, outside the rare case of the miser, wants to accumulate money as such, but only money as a means of power, advancement, recreation. The love of money, which St. Paul condemns as the root of all evil, is only the excessive love of money and what it commands. If the Capitalist desires with due moderation the things which money brings he is quite justified in trading with money to acquire them. In fact, this covetousness, though liable to abuse, is also

the root of all good in the material order; without it human activities would die out; it is the source of all the restless enterprise and inventive genius of man which have helped to create civilization. Other more altruistic motives, of course, there are, corresponding to the individual's ethical development, but to condemn all pursuit of wealth, undertaken for the sake of more wealth rather than for the welfare of Society, is to lay a heavier burden upon the Christian than the Gospel warrants, and to introduce that Puritan exaggeration which in so many other moral questions caricatures Christianity.

**The Just Price,  
the Remedy  
for Capitalism.**

The writer, one of our most stimulating, is on surer grounds when he explains that much must be altered before Capitalism, as it generally functions nowadays, can be approved of by the Christian economist. The unrestricted pursuit of profits prompts the search for cheap labour. Consequently it is to the interest of the Capitalist to have a "pool of unemployment" from which to draw his workman; if the supply exceeds the effective demand, the article will be cheaper. He *needs*, therefore, a landless, propertyless, proletariat for the more rapid increase of wealth. The modern Capitalist has no conception of the pre-Reformation "Just Price": hence, he trades on the needs of the consumer and even creates artificial scarcity to keep his prices high. At the same time he is ever urging on the consumer the purchase of such luxuries as he may happen to manufacture. He tries to make new needs whilst lessening our means of gratifying them. The whole commercial world is shot through with fraud and usury, because the law no longer enforces the Just Price, and the result is that Capitalism, as now worked, does not distribute wealth fairly but rather brings about destitution. As we have often said, that industrial system must be wrong whereby elementary needs, such as food, clothing, and shelter, cannot be supplied, though the materials are present in the country side and there are millions of unoccupied hands that could gather them. During the war the production of food was enormously increased by legislation, and this country, according to competent observers, might have become, under a continuance of the stimulus, almost entirely self-supporting. But, as Messrs. Wright and Penty have pointed out, the vested interests that profit by the importation of food would thus be injured, so the Corn Production Act was repealed in 1921, and we have had six years of spreading unemployment, costing millions more than a bounty on wheat could possibly have cost. Government whenever it sanctions a quasi-monopoly insists on the Just Price—a sum which is determined by the value of the product, *i.e.*, its cost plus a reasonable amount of profit. Railways, for instance, may charge

only a definite mileage rate for passengers. The modern rule that the price of a thing is whatever the seller may choose to ask, tempered though it be in some cases by competition, is one of the main causes of the failure of Capitalism.

**The only  
Moral Ground  
of Prohibition.**

When we expressed last month what we considered a sound view on the moral aspects of Prohibition as embodied in the 18th Amendment to the United States Constitution, we were quite prepared to be adversely criticized by such American Catholics as do not share that view. Judging by their literature, Catholic Prohibitionists in the States do not spare their own prelates who venture to differ from them, and our colleagues of *America* are a favourite target of theirs: so why should a foolhardy Britisher hope to be exempt? As far as we can gather, their opinion in favour of Prohibition rests on two assumptions:—first, that the evil of the American saloon was so vast and so deeply rooted as to justify any infringement of liberty involved in its abolition; and, secondly, that any modification of the law in the direction of allowing beverages of low alcoholic content would inevitably bring back the evil of the saloon. But both these assumptions may reasonably be disputed. We have always granted that Prohibition would be lawful if it were the only effective means of removing a universal source of national degradation and decay, *i.e.*, in circumstances which, in the case of an individual, would call for total abstinence as obligatory in conscience. Our American critics evidently think that their country had reached that deplorable state, and, therefore, we can understand their anxiety for the success of Prohibition. But there are few who would admit that, in spite of the debauchery and corruption encouraged by drinking-saloons, America as a whole was under the same obligation as the helpless habitual drunkard. And fewer still who would consider total Prohibition a reasonable, even if a feasible, remedy. It is the device of a fanatical mind, destructive of the true virtue of Temperance, and unworthy of a community claiming to be civilized.

**A Courteous  
Criticism.**

In the course of some very kindly remarks about our September issue, a writer in *The Tablet* for September 11th said that the views generally taken in these "Notes" would at any rate do something to convince Protestants that not all Jesuits were "on the side of aristocracy, conservatism, and capitalism." It was news to us that the Society had that reputation, even among Protestants. We had thought it sufficiently well known that Francis Suarez, the most representative Jesuit theologian, had done much by his writings to establish the principle of



democracy, and had had the distinction of having his treatise, disproving that characteristic Tory doctrine, the divine right of kings, burnt by order of His Majesty James I. As a matter of fact, party politics of all kinds are alien to the spirit of the Society and expressly forbidden by its constitutions. Accordingly we are grateful to *The Tablet* for bearing witness that we do not belong to one extreme, the party of the Right. We are less grateful, however, for being pushed by the writer into the opposite camp. It has been our ambition in these "Notes" to reflect no "-ism" except Catholicism, to adhere to only one party, the party of Christ, and, especially in social matters and in those regarding international peace, to follow as closely as possible the very decided and obvious lead given by the Holy See. But perhaps we are taking the writer too seriously in protesting against his dictum that "the Editor, so far as is consistent with Catholic loyalty, shows himself a man of the Left." For it is very effectively qualified, as who should say—"The Editor, so far as is consistent with Catholic faith, shows himself an agnostic." *In medio stat virtus*, and that indeed is where the Editor also aims at standing. We trust, then, that foreign readers of *The Tablet*, through want of appreciation of its delicate persiflage, will not be tempted in future to class THE MONTH with the literature of Bolshevism.

**A Correction  
and  
an Apology.**

We find that in the same issue of THE MONTH, in a Note on Church unity, we have unwittingly misinterpreted an expression of Dom Lambert Beauduin in the July *Irénikon*, which seemed to indicate that he believed in "Anglican Continuity." Apparently the sentence, "Les Anglais, en effet, malgré leur insularisme, appartiennent à la culture romano-germanique: pendant dix siècles ils ont été unis au Siège de Pierre," etc., was meant to refer to the English in general, not to the Anglicans, with whom the rest of the paragraph is concerned. Regarding the nation at large, Dom Lambert's statement is, of course, correct, as is also his further comment, "leur Eglise était jadis par ses origines et son développement la plus romaine des Eglises." That is true, and we readily apologize to the learned Benedictine for hastily reading into his words an error of which no competent historian would be capable. This in all sincerity, but with equal sincerity we must still reject his inference that, because the pre-Reformation English Church was superlatively "Roman," the Orthodox by contact with the modern Anglicans will learn to tolerate more easily distinctively "Roman" tenets and practices. There is no trace of the Roman spirit in modern Anglicanism, least of all of that spirit of docility, which is the

mark of a true Catholic *vis-à-vis* a divine authority. It is as anti-Papal as is the East.

•  
First Things  
First.

Authority, after all, is the beginning and the end of the Anglican question. Newman, most gentle and considerate of controversialists, put it so to the hesitating Pusey (July 21, 1867)—“The Roman Communion is either the Church or it is not: if it is not, don't seek to join it; if it is, don't bargain with it: beggars must not be choosers.” Christ instituted a teaching Church endowed with His own commission and infallibility. That teaching Church exists to-day, for He promised it would survive to the end of time. It is a visible Church, for no otherwise can the seat of authority be determined. It is a single Church, for Christ founded only one. No one can belong to this Church, or enter it from outside, who does not accept these truths of faith regarding its essential nature. The schismatic East, now largely heretical as well, does not belong to the Church, though possessing valid Sacraments: still less, do manifestly heretical bodies who have no valid priesthood or sacrifice. This is the unbroken front of Catholic teaching in which no breach can possibly be made. But those who minimize this doctrine or put it out of sight, even temporarily, may very easily give the impression that the Catholic defence against heresy has been breached, and that is why we hold, with Newman, that the exclusive claims of the Church should never be concealed. To dally with theories of “Corporate Reunion” is to encourage false hopes and delay conversions. Our duty is to the generation of our own contemporaries whom we must beseech and admonish, *opportune, importune*, to embrace the whole faith once delivered to the Saints. No doubt it is theoretically possible that a number of validly baptized Anglicans, who accept *ex animo* the whole Catholic faith, including Papal supremacy and infallibility, may secede from the Establishment and seek admittance as a group into the Church. But, if so, by the very facts of the case, they will come not as a “Church” but as a group of earnest and like-minded individuals. May such group conversions be numerous and frequent, but the hope of them must not in any way impede our present task of plying rod and line.

THE EDITOR.

## III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Assumption B.V.M.**, Catholic Belief in [E. Dumontet in *Revue Apologétique*, August 1, 1926, p. 561].

**God and Secondary Causes** [A. Bouysonnie in *Revue Apologétique*, Sept. 15, 1926, p. 707].

**Kingdom of God: the New Feast** [E. Bergin, S.J., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Sept. 1926, p. 225].

**Religion and Science, The Conflict between** [P. J. Gannon, S.J., in *Studies*, Sept. 1926, p. 464].

## CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Anti-Catholic Bigotry amongst Socialists** [H. Somerville in *Catholic Times*, Sept. 3, 1926, p. 11].

**Anti-Catholic Errors: Instances of Longevity of** [R. J. Kane in *The Commonwealth*, Sept. 1, 1926, p. 405].

**Catholicism and Pessimism** [R. R. Hull in *Thought*, Sept. 1926, p. 335].

**Free-thought, The Imposture of** [R. R. Hull in *Catholic World*, Sept. 1926, p. 788].

**Intolerance, Catholic, in Spain: is it really such?** [*Tablet*, Sept. 4, 1926, p. 297].

**Mexican Catholic Labour Union's protest** [*America*, Sept. 4, 1926, p. 496: Troubles in 1914, *Catholic Times*, Sept. 10, 1926, p. 8].

**Mexico: Religious persecution in, really an attack on human rights** [F. H. Harper in *America*, Aug. 14, 1926, p. 416; v. also p. 413: P. Dudon in *Etudes*, Aug. 20, 1926, p. 486].

**Mexican Situation, Genesis of** [M. C. Hollis in *Catholic Truth*, Sept.-Oct. 1926, p. 129; Church and State in Mexico: *Month*, Oct. 1926, p. 318].

## POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Christmas Carols** [*La Vie et Les Arts Liturgiques*, Aug. 1926, p. 463, Sept. 1926, p. 508].

**Church decay in U.S.A. through rural exodus** [W. Schaefer in *Homiletic Review*, Sept. 1926, p. 1286].

**Holland, Catholicity in** [Statistics etc., Arch. of Utrecht quoted in *Documentation Catholique*, Sept. 11, 1926, p. 349].

**Liberty in U.S.A., Decline of** [Dr. J. A. Ryan in *Studies*, Sept. 1926, p. 411].

**Peace, International work for, by Catholics at Havre** [Y. de la Brière, S.J., in *Etudes*, Sept. 5, 1926, p. 601: J. Eppstein in *Month*, Oct. 1926, p. 289].

**Proletariat, The, not God's institution** [R. Ginns, O.P., in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept. 1926, p. 237].

**Protestantism decaying in England** ["Verax" in *Catholic Times*, Aug. 27, 1926, p. 5].

**Single-Tax, Illusions of** [H. Somerville in *Catholic Times*, Sept. 17, 1926, p. 11].

**Trade-Unions: Proper Status and Functions of** [H. Somerville in *Messenger of Sacred Heart*, Sept. 1926, p. 284].

# REVIEWS

## I—BLESSED ANGELA OF FOLIGNO<sup>1</sup>

AT last we possess the authentic text of the so-called "Book of Blessed Angela of Foligno," which embodies all the information regarding that remarkable mystic which is ever likely to be recovered. For this happy result we are indebted in part to Père T. Ferré, O.F.M., and in part to Mgr. Faloci Pulignani, but the main credit for the painstaking researches which have led to this consummation belongs to Père Paul Doncoeur, S.J., who contributes to the volume before us an admirable introduction explaining in detail the various stages by which the truth has been made clear. Although we may feel gratitude to Ernest Hello for awakening interest in Blessed Angela by the vivid picture of her life and teaching which he has printed in what purports to be a translation of the "Book," it becomes abundantly evident from the work before us, not only that the French impressionist's incredibly free rendering has more in it of Hello than of Angela, but also that the text upon which his study is based is a spurious text which quite disguises and confuses the original relation of its parts. Something like what the late Baron Friedrich von Hügel believed to have happened in the case of the "Vita e Dottrina" of St. Catherine of Genoa has undoubtedly occurred in the "Compilation d'Avignon," the Celestine manuscript (now M.S. Lat. 5620 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris) which formed until recently the sole foundation of all our printed texts. For the first time Père Doncoeur has solved the problem of Blessed Angela's literary remains. We have, as he points out, three distinct elements in the "Book," which the "Compilation d'Avignon" has arbitrarily jumbled together and welded into an incomprehensible whole by suppressions and additions which are often seriously misleading. The Latin text here printed, which is based upon a thorough investigation of all the known manuscripts, consists first of all of the "Memoriale," an account of Angela's spiritual development taken down from her own lips by her Franciscan confessor, whose name began with an A and was probably Adam—not Arnold, as has hitherto been assumed. This Memoriale, which was duly censored by a number of leading Franciscan theologians, was begun after the year 1285 and completed between July, 1296, and May, 1297. Secondly, we have thirty-three separate and miscellaneous documents, many of them being letters or memoranda by Angela herself, and the rest notes or brief statements

<sup>1</sup> *Le Livre de la Bienheureuse Angèle de Foligno.* Ed. P. Doncoeur, S.J. Art Catholique, Paris. Pp. xlii, 236. 1925.

concerning her and her teaching, which were apparently drafted by one or more of her disciples. Finally there is a brief account of her last days and of her farewell instructions to those who regarded her as a spiritual mother. We have in one of the manuscripts a definite statement that she died on 4th January, 1309, after an illness which had lasted since the previous September. All these materials, now presented in a reliable form, are of exceptional interest to the student of mediæval mysticism. Père Doncoeur has added an appendix of thirty pages in which he records the more important variants of his texts and adds some few notes. As he also promises another volume which is to contain a translation—a welcome adjunct to documents couched sometimes in a Latinity which is far from classical—we may probably expect some further elucidation of phrases likely to remain obscure to those who are not altogether at home in the Italian of Dante and his contemporaries.

## 2—VARIETIES OF SCHOLASTIC METAPHYSICS<sup>1</sup>

IT is a common notion that scholastic philosophy, being a traditional and official system imposed and maintained by ecclesiastical authority, is necessarily condemned to sink into a dull uniformity, leaving no room either for originality of thought or freedom of opinion. Superficially this misconception is very plausible. Scholasticism does present a suspiciously rigid and united front to its modern rivals. Thomist and Scotist and Suarezian are distinctions so minute from the standpoint of the vexed questions of modern philosophy that the external observer may be pardoned for missing the significance of them.

Within the School itself the case is different. There the purely internal quarrels are apt to bulk so large that far larger issues are apt to be eclipsed.

The three works dealt with in this review illustrate very well the internal antagonisms which to a large extent make up the life of present-day Scholasticism. The fact that they are the works of Jesuit writers makes their divergence all the more striking. The Society has always recognized the value and necessity of intellectual unanimity amongst its members. The three volumes before us may be taken as indicating the practical limitations of such an ideal. Within the well-defined limits of theological and philosophical orthodoxy there are differences of

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Les Points Fondamentaux de la Philosophie Thomiste*, traduit de l'italien du R.P. Mattiussi, S.J., par l'Abbé Jean Levillain. Turin: Marietti. Pp. xii. 396.

(2) *A travers la Métaphysique*, par Auguste Valensin. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. 251.

(3) *Institutiones Metaphysicae Generalis*, par le Père P. Descoqs, S.J. Vol. I. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. 644. Price, 60.00 fr.

intellectual method and outlook which it is practically impossible to do away with. These differences constitute what may be called the variations within the single common type or species which we call Scholastic philosophy.

Fr. Guido Mattiussi, the author of the work of which the Abbé Levillain has given us a skilful and readable French version, was, down to the time of his death in 1925, one of the ablest and best-known exponents of pure Thomism. No one, it may safely be said, was better qualified to do the work which he has proposed to himself in this book—namely, to provide a clear and orderly exposition of the propositions known since 1914 as the twenty-four theses of Thomistic philosophy. These propositions have often been commented on before: little novelty is possible in the way either of argument or objection. The final estimate of every demonstration must be left to the judgment of the competent reader. As is well known, opinion has always been divided on many of the propositions. Fr. Mattiussi was convinced of the rigid necessity of all of them as consequences of indisputable first principles. All that he writes is inspired by that conviction. Those who do not share this view will probably find much to try their patience in what they may regard as gratuitous and uncritical dogmatism. The object of the book being mainly to expose the traditional Thomist doctrine rather than to defend it at length, less space has been given to objections than might have been desired. The result is an apparent one-sidedness, which will leave the inquiring reader very often unsatisfied. In spite of its restricted scope, however, this is a stimulating work, and the clearness and trenchancy of its arguments are very positive merits.

Père Auguste Valensin is, like Mattiussi, a convinced Thomist, but of a more genial and adaptable kind. The little work entitled *A travers la Métaphysique* is a collection of essays loosely strung together on such subjects as Kantism, Pantheism, Thomism, the Theory of Analogy, etc. They form part of the materials of a comprehensive study of Pantheism which the author had in contemplation, but which ill-health has compelled him (not permanently, we trust) to lay aside. P. Valensin's sympathetic presentation of philosophic difficulties and their solution will probably be more effective with most readers than the uncompromising style of Fr. Mattiussi. Some of the essays are rather slight: a more developed treatment of fewer subjects would have been better in so small a volume. The treatment is for the most part severely abstract, but the literary quality is throughout so good that the expositions and arguments should be within the comprehension of any intelligent reader.

In both these writers we find the same conviction of the finality and sufficiency of a metaphysical system, built up from certain fundamental propositions extracted from the text of St. Thomas.



They both represent the positive, constructive or reconstructive tendency in modern Catholic philosophy. Both appear to be agreed that certain metaphysical controversies which have for centuries been open in the Schools, may now be regarded as closed: that the *placita* of the Thomistic school, as opposed to those of the Scotist or Suarezian, may be assumed as the basis of a philosophic synthesis, which shall be not merely tenable, but certain. Fr. Mattiussi inculcates this with more rigour and ruthlessness, and with less regard to the historical development of thought outside the Scholastic pale: Père Valensin displays a wider erudition and a greater apologetic skill. But the standpoint of the two writers is essentially the same. We now turn to a writer whose outlook upon the same problems is widely different.

If an enthusiastic admiration for St. Thomas, and a close familiarity with his writings, justify the claim of discipleship, Père Descocs may confidently make that claim. In his *Institutiones Metaphysicae Generalis* he has set his hand to a work of great utility and vast compass. It is a treatise on the elements of ontology and is to be in four volumes. The scale of the work may be estimated from the first volume, which is in our hands. It contains the treatises on Being, Truth and Goodness, with a discussion of the three fundamental principles of Identity, Contradiction and Sufficient Reason, and it runs to 644 pages, large octavo. The author's plan is so ample that problems of logic, psychology, ethics and theology are inevitably brought within its scope. This gives an appearance of discursiveness to the treatment; but we believe that serious students will be sincerely grateful for the abundance and variety of the fare provided. A somewhat novel feature is the free use of French when dealing with modern controversies. The scholastic theses and their proofs are expounded in Latin, but all the *quaestiones* and *quaestiunculae* are discussed in French. The greater part of the work is thus in that language, and the author hopes one day to publish a complete vernacular version of it.

Père Descocs' main preoccupation with the problems of ontology is critical and logical. He does not accept the view that the twenty-four theses of classical Thomism can all be demonstratively proved, or that the controversies with Scotists and Suarezians have been triumphantly concluded. He has before now proved a troublesome critic of a certain type of metaphysical "synthesis" which flourishes more luxuriously in France and Italy than in northern lands. He believes (and many will agree with him) that the logic of such works is often far too easy-going to be trustworthy. It has required no small courage and an heroic industry to persevere as he has done, in what must often have seemed an invidious and ungrateful task. If his work has swollen to almost unmanageable dimensions in consequence, it at least provides convincing evidence of the accumulations of matter demanding much critical sifting in

the history of modern scholasticism. Père Descoqs' work will be of the greatest value as a guide to current controversies, even to those who do not go with him in his conclusions. So numerous and, in many cases, so subtle are these controversies that the reader may get the impression at first that modern scholasticism is in danger, like the mediæval, of losing itself in a profitless dialectic: and perhaps the author himself may incur the reproach of indulging at times in unnecessary refinements. Neither of these judgments would be correct, however. The scholasticism of to-day is purified of the folly of idle and ostentatious subtlety which vitiated the later mediæval period, and Père Descoqs shows no signs of ever having suffered from it. To the present writer, at all events, the spirit of his work appears to be just what it should be—impartial, discriminating, scrupulously candid. The thoroughness of the treatment involves, doubtless, a certain prolixity. Readers who want brief and telling arguments for one side of a question, will go elsewhere. But those who can endure to hear both sides, and a judicial summing-up, will find Père Descoqs probably the most useful of all modern writers. Of all the present varieties of scholastic metaphysics, his, it seems to us, is the most likely to appeal to the best type of student. The present work is one which neither professors nor critics of Catholic philosophy can afford to ignore.

J. B.

---

## SHORT NOTICES.

### PHILOSOPHY.

**T**HOSE acquainted with Mgr. Olgiati's admirable studies on St. Thomas and the problem of knowledge generally will be glad to hear of his new essay entitled *L'Idealismo di Giorgio Berkeley ed il suo significato storico* ("Vita e Pensiero": 15.00 l.). The name of Berkeley will always have its place in the history of philosophy and the problem he professed to solve is of perennial interest.

We notice the appearance of *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis in Metaphysicam Aristotelis Commentaria*. Cura et Studio, P. Fr. M.-R. Cathala, O.P., (Marietti: 30.00 l.), in the useful students' edition of St. Thomas's works now published by the great Turin house.

### DEVOTIONAL.

The foundation-virtue of all moral perfection, humility, which the Rev. Franz Ruemmer calls *The Great Secret of the Saints* is discussed with much insight in a treatise with that title (Herder Book Co.: 5s.).

The inspired writings are full of inspired sayings revealing more than human reason could have reached or can fathom. Hence they slip naturally into our prayers, God's language being fittingly addressed to God. The collection called *Texts for Prayer* (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d. n.) compiled and classified by a nun of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin will be found very useful either for ejaculatory prayer or even for sustained meditation.

## LITURGICAL.

We welcome an interesting study of Biblical Poetry called *I Canti Divini*, Vol. I. (Marietti: 20.00 l.) by P. Domenico M. Tricerri, O.P. Those who recite daily the Divine Office would find that labour lightened and refreshed by such knowledge of the structure and meaning of the Psalms as is given here.

## SOCIOLOGY.

The collection of thoughtful "Essays in Reconstruction" to which Father Cuthbert has given the name of the second, *Socialism or Democracy* (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.), suffers from its title. Both those terms are of very vague significance, and they may be used, as the writer well knows, as practically equivalent. The antithesis he wishes to stress is that between the natural and the supernatural views of life, between the absolute State and the true City of God, between material civilization and that due to Christ. However, the nine essays of the collection can all be read with profit. Father Cuthbert is a Catholic Social Reformer, a disciple of Pope Leo XIII., and advocates those principles which in its own way THE MONTH has always striven for. The C.S.G. will welcome the book, as will those enlightened Catholic teachers who wish to equip their pupils properly for the Christian's work in life.

## BIOGRAPHICAL.

The prettily illustrated life of St. Madeleine Sophie, called by the authoress, Madame Maud Monahan, *The Children's Saint* (Longmans: 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.), is of immense interest for young and grown-up children—gripping the reader from beginning to end. One feels oneself carried back to the little city in Umbria, where another "Child of God" sang with his Brothers and Sisters, the birds of the field, played with his little Sister the Lamb or caressed his big Brother Wolf. How human and accessible "Madame Sophie," the farseeing promoter of higher education and foundress of highly qualified educational establishments, was is brought home to us by those charming sketches. These are features, copied from the image of Him who is the Children's Friend. The delightful style will suit the simple conditions of the Kindergarten as well as more refined tastes.

## HISTORICAL.

*Nirvana* (Beauchesne: 9.00 fr.), a volume in the excellent series *Etudes sur l'histoire des Religions*, found its predestined and entirely sufficient editor in M. de la Vallée Poussin. The word Nirvana is in common use to-day and would give little trouble in a Cross-Words Puzzle. Its meaning is another matter. We need to know that in its historical and philosophic setting, not in the weird blend of old error and new nonsense which is set before the world under the name of Theosophy. And here we find clear and accurate information.

In two local studies, full of interest to the flourishing Catholic communities of the Middle West, *Catholic Beginnings in Kansas City, Missouri* and *Saint Ferdinand of Florissant* (both, Loyola Press: Chicago) Father G. J. Garraghan, S.J., has collected information about the period subsequent to that covered by the well-known *Jesuit Relations* and in many respects as fascinating.

A very useful course of Church History might be built up on *The Church in the World* (Longmans: 3 parts: 9d., 9d. and 1s. respectively:

or 3s. complete) which the indefatigable Madame Forbes has compiled from the most reliable authorities. Each section is furnished with a full bibliography, and all the great personages and events in Church History are adequately depicted. The book will do much to prevent Catholics from leaving school in ignorance of the life-story of their spiritual Mother.

## LITERARY.

The name of Petrarch is pre-eminent among the names associated with the great movement in human history which we call the Renaissance. There are other and far greater names but none so representative. Petrarch seems to embody the new life and he is its acknowledged leader. Not without reason therefore is he spoken of as the "Father of modern classic culture" or in the words of Canon Tatham, whose scholarly study—**Francesco Petrarca: His Life and Correspondence**. Vol. I. (Sheldon Press: 18s. n.)—is now before us, "the first modern man of letters"; and it was natural for an English historian, lamenting the set-back of the New Learning in England, to describe the Tudor Reformation as laying its foundations in the murder of the English Erasmus and setting up its gates in the blood of the English Petrarch. Erasmus and Petrarch—these will always be the two great representative names. Hence the importance of his "Life and Letters" and the interest of such a learned and detailed study as that now published by Canon Tatham. The volume we are noticing deals with the earlier years and the lyric poems. We shall welcome the further fruits of the author's *lungo studio e grande amore*.

The historical drama which Father Cuthbert has written on the fruitful subject **St. Francis** (Longmans: 5s. n.) is a play for the study rather than for the stage, though with judicious "cutting" it might possibly be acted. However, it is very readable and the various scenes and conversations are skilfully arranged to bring out both the history and the character of the Saint and of those associated with him in his life's work.

The interest of the outside world in St. Francis is not confined to his poems or his love of Nature: it extends, as the works of many scholars show, to all items connected with the foundation of his Order. Professors Walter Seton, for instance, and A. G. Little are recognized authorities on the history of the Saint. And now Messrs. Dent and Sons publish **The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany** (5s. n.) translated by Miss E. Gurney Salter, another Franciscan student, from the critical editions by Little and Boehmer of the *Chronicles* of Thomas of Eccleston and Jordan of Giano. The primitive simplicity, poverty and Gospel spirit of the Friars Minor is written largely over these early accounts, which, although they have not the charm of the *Fioretti*, yet abound in delightful anecdotes. The book is admirably produced by the publishers.

## FICTION.

Mr. Jeffery Farnol in **The High Adventure** (Sampson Low: 7s. 6d. n.) has crowded into a single story the material for several, so lavish is he of exciting episodes and whimsical personalities. It is a capital tale of virtue triumphant and villainy defeated—in the long run. Some of the "low" characters are drawn in the very vein of Dickens, and if the author's reproduction of the Irish brogue were as successful as is his Cockney dialect, the book would be almost faultless of its kind.

Mr. E. C. Reed has visibly matured in style, and his **Passionate Youth** (John Long: 7s. 6d. n.) is an excellent piece of writing. His story, too, is well-conceived and though there are a few arbitrary coincidences they do not seriously impair its plausibility. The character of Gaspard, a sort of "Beloved Vagabond," is especially well and consistently drawn.

A book that has evidently been "lived," telling of the struggles of an invalid towards health and of an aspirant towards literary fame, is **The Lean Years** (Methuen: 7s. 6d. n.) by Julian Laverack. It is instinct with humour as with pure love for Nature, and is altogether wholesome and refreshing.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Dr. Franz Schwyer, formerly Minister of State for Interior Affairs in Bavaria, had been invited to contribute an article to the "Staatslexikon der Görres-Gesellschaft" on "Secret Societies," but soon discovered that the rich material available could not be dealt with exhaustively within the small space of a Dictionary. In the present book, **Politische Geheimverbände** (Herder: Freiburg: 6.50 m.), based on historical facts and the author's own experience, we are given a clear, systematic exposition of the organization and object of a good number of existing secret societies and movements. Valuable, up-to-date information is contained in the first and perhaps most prominent chapter on Freemasonry. After some obscure, merely continental secret clubs we review the ranks of Orangemen, "Fenian Brotherhood," Ku-Klux-Klan, Spanish Comuneros, Italian Carbonari and Fascisti, Slavonic Omladina-youths, Russian Decabrists, Nihilists, Anarchists, Bolsheviks—all marching in file before the eyes of the reader. Although by no means exhaustive, the book is an interesting attempt to give some insight into the far-reaching—mostly noxious—influence of political secret societies, growing up in an almost bewildering abundance on the soil of the modern dechristianized civilization.

The zeal of God's House has not so devoured the Rev. E. J. Quigley as not to leave him plenty of vigour to describe how that House should be built and cared for—and how it should not. In **Church-making and Church-keeping** (Gill and Sons: 3s. 6d. n.) he has gathered together the Church's legislation on church construction and ornamentation, and has compared with that standard the results of his keen observation of actual practice. It is a stimulating and exceedingly practical book and omits nothing, whether of law or its application, which can help to make seemly the Church of God.

#### MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Abbot Cummins' **Saints and Shrines of Knaresborough** (Parrs Ltd.: 1s.) is mainly concerned with the holy hermit Robert, whose various haunts are described with much archæological learning.

Children cannot begin too early to love and appreciate the Holy Sacrifice, and the Rev. W. R. Kelly's **The Mass for Children** (B.O. and W.: 1s. 3d.) with its large print, simple language, and vivid illustrations, will be found a valuable means to this end.

Addressed to older minds but still in a popular style, the Abbot E. Carronti's **The Spirit of the Liturgy** (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minn.) translated from the Italian by Virgil Michel, O.S.B., gives a complete exposition of the meaning and use of the Liturgy in public worship, and shows what a valuable aid it is to the production of a virile and practical piety.

Amongst the recent C.T.S. output we notice *The Conversion of a Modernist* by André Bavier and several reprinted stories, *A Narrow Escape*, *Roy's Adventures*, and *The Strathgowan Mystery* by Joseph Carmichael; other reprints are *St. Peter Canisius* by Rev. T. Crompton, *Maria Monk* (182nd thousand!), *Saint Teresa of Lisieux* (116th thousand) by Rev. A. Ross, *Hell* by Father Joseph Rickaby, *His Comings and His Angels* by Mother St. Paul, *The True Church* by Rev. J. Keating and *Requiescat in Pace* by Father R. Clarke, S.J.

The C.T.S. of Ireland send *The Death of the Cross*, a physiological study by Dr. E. Le Bec; *Evolution and Catholicity* by Sir Bertram Windle, a clear statement of their relations; *St. John Chrysostom* by the Rev. C. Scantlebury, S.J.; *The Apostles* by Rodney Pope; and a sheaf of attractive stories.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- BROWNE AND NOLAN, LTD., Dublin.  
*Origin of the Sisters of St. Louis*, from the French. Pp. xix. 332.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.  
*The Week*. By F. H. Colson. Pp. ix. 126. Price, 5s. n.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.  
*Many twopenny pamphlets*.
- C.T.S. OF IRELAND, Dublin.  
*Many twopenny pamphlets*.
- CONSTABLE, London.  
*The Dance of Life*. By H. Ellis. Pp. xiv. 340. Price, 6s. n.
- DENT AND SONS, London.  
*The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany*. Translated and edited by E. Gurney Salter, Litt.D. Pp. xxxvi. 198. Price, 5s. n.
- GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN, London.  
*Origen and his Work*. By Eugène de Faye. Translated by F. Rothwell. Pp. 192. Price, 5s. n.
- HERDER BOOK CO., London.  
*Elements of Experimental Psychology*. By Père de la Vaissière. Pp. xiii. 438. Price, 12s. *Jesus Christ, the Exiled King*. By Henry Wood, S.J. Pp. xvii. 295. Price, 9s. n. *Following our Divine Model*. By J. F. McElhone, C.S.C. Pp. x. 332. Price, 9s. n.
- HERDER, Freiburg.  
*Elementa Philosophiæ Aristotelico-Thomistica*. II. By Jos. Gredt, O.S.B. 4th edit. Pp. xviii. 466. Price, 2 vols., 23 m. *Wilhelm Eberschweiler*. By Walter Sierp, S.J. Pp. xviii. 286. Price, 6 m.
- LA PENSÉE CATHOLIQUE, Liège.  
*De Castitate*. By B. H. Merhelbach, O.P. Pp. 104. Price, 1s. 6d.
- LONGMANS, London.  
*The Four Mysteries of the Faith*. By Mgr. Kolbe, D.D. Pp. xvi. 204. Price, 6s. n. *High Roads and Cross Roads*. By A. Chisholm. Pp. vii. 87. Price, 2s. 6d. n.
- MARIETTI, Turin.  
*The Jubilee at Home during 1925 and 1926*. By Rev. J. Lacan. Pp. 104. Price, 8d.
- METHUEN AND CO., London.  
*Concerning the Inner Life*. By E. Underhill. Pp. 93. Price, 2s. n. *The Lean Years*. By Julian Laverack. Pp. 248. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- MUSEUM LESSIANUM, Louvain.  
*De Bonitate et Malitia Actuum*. By V. Cathrein, S.J. Pp. 148. Price, 8.50 fr.
- OLDENBOURG, Munich.  
*Handbuch der Philosophie*. Nos. 6 and 7. By Prof. E. Rothacker-Heidelberg.
- PARRS LTD., Knaresborough.  
*Saints and Shrines of Knaresborough*. By Abbot Cummins, O.S.B. Pp. 27. Price, 1s.

[Mention of many other publications unavoidably held over.]



